



BL  
82  
H39

CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



Cornell University Library

BL82 .H39

Creeds and religious beliefs as they app



3 1924 031 018 587

olin



# CREEDS

AND

## RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

AS THEY APPEAR TO

A PLAIN BUSINESS MAN

BY

JOHN S. HAWLEY



NEW YORK

WILBUR B. KETCHAM

7 AND 9 WEST EIGHTEENTH STREET

COPYRIGHT, 1900,  
By WILBUR B. KETCHAM


310820B

X

To my old Friend, School-fellow, and Townsman,  
DR. JAMES T. SWEETMAN, of Charlton, Saratoga  
County, N. Y., this book is dedicated, as an expres-  
sion of my appreciation of his invaluable work in  
aid of the Charlton Industrial Farm School.

JOHN S. HAWLEY.

YONKERS, N. Y., September 1, 1900.



## Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.



# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
Introduction.....	7
What do Christians think of One Another.....	11
The Apostle's Creed.....	14
Brahmanism and Buddhism.....	21
Confucianism.....	23
Mohammedanism.....	26
Hebraism.....	31
Christianity.....	35
Roman Catholicism.....	50
The Greek Church.....	71
Lutheranism.....	72
Episcopalianism.....	80
Presbyterianism.....	110
Methodism.....	116
The Baptist Faith.....	117
Congregationalism.....	119
Unitarianism.....	119
Universalism.....	123
Christian Science and Mental Science.....	127
Agnosticism.....	135
Conclusion and Summary.....	138
Appendix.....	161



“Work and despair not ; bring thy mite,  
Nor care how small it be ;  
God is with all that love the right,  
The truthful and the free.

“No act falls fruitless ; none can tell  
How vast its power may be ;  
Nor what results enfolded dwell  
Within it silently.”



## INTRODUCTION.

MY friends and acquaintances will be surprised indeed, to learn that I have attempted to write a book, but not more so than the writer. I have much to ask of their indulgence for the lack of finish or completeness in both sentences and chapters, and no one will be better aware of the crudeness of this little volume than myself.

The subjects under consideration have usually been treated by theological scholars, who brought to their work exhaustive study and investigation.\* This work will not for a moment compare with theirs, except that it has the merit of brevity.

It is written, however, by one who is in a perfectly independent position, not influenced by fear or favor, unhampered by church tenets or ecclesiastical inventions. It purposes merely to give in as few words as possible a few points of general information on Religious Beliefs to persons who will not be likely to take the time to

\* Their great mistake, however, is that they study only from one point of view—like a democrat who never examines a republican newspaper and vice versa—looking for politics rather than facts.

study such subjects, except in a superficial manner. I have only attempted to write as one business man would speak to another, calling things by their right names and wasting no time in words.

Some one (perhaps more) of my friends will be likely to anxiously ask, "Does John Hawley believe in the Bible?"

I will answer, "Yes, I believe in everything *good* in the Bible."

"Ah! But do you not believe that it is the inspired word of God, written by men who were divinely and specially inspired, and therefore writers only of explicit truth?"

I will answer frankly, "No; writers were no more inspired two or three thousand years ago than they are to-day, or than they will be in the future. How absurd it would be for us to insist that our descendants—two or three thousand years hence—should believe exactly as we do, *regardless of developments that will then have become history!* For aught we know, men of this opening century may be the authors of what will be embodied in the Bible of two thousand years hence.

But what a grand thing it is that we have the Bible with its history of the development of religion, which commenced when man began to think!

And has enlightened religion improved? Com-

pare the sacrifice laws of the ancients, the cruelties of Moses and Joshua, with the humanities of to-day and realize that it is progressive religious thought that has brought about the improvement.

If we judge the future by the past, is it not probable that higher beliefs and higher morality will develop a grander civilization? And ought we to claim the right to make laws or rules for controlling the spiritual thought of the people of those coming days? Clearly it is most just and proper for the people of all ages to adapt their beliefs to the lights they have.

Theologians may perhaps inquire what right I have to discuss their specialty? I reply that they often criticise the methods and doings of business men (often with propriety), and for a plain business man to express his opinions of Creeds and Beliefs seems only a matter of reciprocity.

It seems to me that preachers and teachers of dogmatic religion, begin with two serious mistakes, viz.: First, they *force* a belief upon themselves; though it is often lacking in that absolute essential, perfect sincerity. Second, they endeavor to force these same beliefs upon others, and thereby would stop all effort of earnest men, who are endeavoring to ascertain truth.

As for the first, I think it wrong to *compel* ourselves to believe anything. As for the second, I claim the inalienable right to investigate as I

please, to choose my own teachers, and to decide for myself. I cannot honestly do otherwise. I intend to say what I think, and I believe that he who sows a seed, from which springs even the smallest advance in liberal Christian Faith, is a doer of good.

Theology in effect is often simply a system for the retarding of progressive religious thought. It has always placed a higher value upon its own doctrines and theories than upon facts.

Many of these "doctrines" are without foundations. Like houses built upon the unstable sand, they are propped up by superstition, tradition, and legend, but they must inevitably fall before science, intelligence, and reason. And the sooner they do, the better. Real and enduring theology must be founded upon the rock of truth!



## CREEDS AND RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

---

### WHAT DO CHRISTIANS THINK OF ONE ANOTHER ?

IF you ask a dozen members of various Christian churches what the beliefs are of those that belong to churches other than their own, it is surprising to note the answers you receive.

In a general way they will tell you that the Catholic believes in the power of the priest or bishop to save or to condemn him, that he worships the virgin Mary and innumerable saints, and that he believes that when the priest has forgiven his sins he starts off with a clean record, no matter what may have been his former life. They will probably agree that the Baptist believes that immersion is the essential form of baptism. The Episcopalian will be considered a believer in forms and ceremonies. They will gravely tell you that the Unitarian does not believe in Jesus Christ, and are not quite sure whether the Universalists burn a Bible every Sunday in their churches or

not, but they have heard so. The Presbyterians are supposed to be followers of John Calvin, while the Lutherans are Catholics who do not acknowledge the Pope.

Not only are members of churches uninformed as to the beliefs of their sister churches, but many of them are not clear as to the beliefs of their own denominations. Ask an Episcopalian, for example, if he believes in foreordination, and he will usually say, "no"; suggest to him that such a doctrine is to be found in his prayer-book, and he will say, "Oh! no," and perhaps rather indignantly ask you "where it is to be found?" Quote to him No. 17 of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and he will be surprised, and admit he never read it before. Ask him if he believes his minister is empowered to say when his sins are forgiven, and he will reply "Certainly not." Yet he says Amen to this sentiment every time he attends church.

(From the "Prayer for the Absolution or Remission of sins.")

"He hath given power and commandment to His Ministers to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins."

In like manner the Presbyterian knows but little of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Methodist has read only a part of his Church Discipline.

ARTICLE XVII.—OF PREDESTINATION AND  
ELECTION.

“ Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour.”

## THE APOSTLES' CREED.

PERHAPS no better beginning of this Chapter can be made than by quoting the two following letters, which will explain themselves.

NEW YORK, *June 13*, 1899.

To the Editor of **THE OUTLOOK**.

In your number of June 3d, is an editorial which I read with surprise and not a little regret. It is entitled, "Unity in Worship," and is in the main a plea for the adoption by Protestant Churches generally, of a liturgy similar to that of the Episcopal Church. It also especially advocates the (so-called) Apostles' Creed as a basis of Church Unity, though it scores the Nicene Creed as "not very intelligible philosophy."

Of the Apostle's Creed, the Article says it "was not constructed at all, but grew."

It also says the Apostle's Creed "is fact."

It is beyond my understanding how such a liberal and progressive teacher as **THE OUTLOOK** can voice these sentiments.

My father was a strict Presbyterian and I was bred in that faith.

Later in life, for many years, I attended the Episcopal Church. I used to read the Creed mechanically (the usual way), and thought little about it. So, for the time, all went well, for my mentality quietly rested in the supposition that what I had been taught must be correct.

But after a time I began to think of this Creed and to wonder upon what authority it was based.

From that time I could read only the first few lines of the Creed, for I could not conscientiously say I believed most of it.

Why is it called the Apostles' Creed, when there is absolutely

no evidence that the Apostles ever used or ever even heard of it?

How misleading is this!

Where is the authority for saying Jesus was the only Son of God when he repeatedly called his Apostles his brethren? When or where did he call himself God's only Son?

Why should such emphasis be given to "Conceived of the Holy Ghost?" "Born of the Virgin Mary?" Of how much significance are these details?

Yet they seem by the Creed to be of more importance than the teachings of our Great Master!

"Suffered under Pontius Pilate." Would it not be nearer the fact to say, "Suffered under the Theology of his time?" For Pilate wished to save His life, but the Chief Priests sought to kill Him.

"He descended into Hell." Where is Hell?

"He ascended into Heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God."

Where is Heaven? Does God live in a certain place and does He sit upon a throne as the King of an earthly nation sits upon his throne?

That is the teaching of the Creed, but I cannot find it in the teachings of Jesus.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost." Is this meant to refer to the inspiration of a Holy Spirit that speaks to us all? Why should this inward voice—this Comforter—be referred to as a person?

"The Communion of Saints" seems to me to be only mystifying. Who are the Saints? How do they commune? How is it with those other than Saints? Do they also "commune?"

"The resurrection of the body!" Possibly we shall be told that this means the resurrection of the Spiritual body. But is it not plainly apparent that it was intended to refer to the physical body? Besides, if the Spirit does not die, how could it be resurrected?

To me the so-called Apostles' Creed is an indorsement of the beliefs that were held by Christians through the dark ages. All honor to them for their beliefs under the lights they had! But it was after all a two-story and basement theology. They believed this Earth to be the center of the universe, the main floor

of the structure. God lived in Heaven, which embraced the upper story, while Hell was in the basement! The good at death went to the upper story, while the wicked were sent to the basement to suffer forever, with no pitying hand held toward them and no voice to instruct or lead them!

To believe all this in ancient days was natural; to truly believe it to-day is impossible!

What shall be said of those who each week solemnly say they believe the Creed, and then endeavor to explain it away?

There is no satisfaction and absolutely no value in a half-believed Creed.

The Master never uttered more remarkable words than when he said, "God is Spirit: and they who worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth."

The chief excuse for clinging to this Creed seems to be its antiquity. How old is it? I am told by the most able student I know, that it cannot be traced to a time prior to the fifth century. The writer can remember men who were born 140 years ago, one-tenth as far back as the age of the Apostles' Creed, fourteen hundred years! Geologists go back more than fourteen hundred millions of years and find no trace of a beginning!

Is the antiquity of theories that were believed fourteen hundred years ago so great, as to make it a theological necessity that they should still be indorsed by people who live in the light of modern science?

Is it inconsistent with true reverence for the highest form of religion, that we believe in the discoveries of Copernicus and Newton?

Are we given our powers of reason and understanding for no purpose so far as religious belief is effected?

In science, in business, in all the practical affairs of life, we correct errors as we find them. Is it not of far greater importance that errors in our highest beliefs should be corrected, whenever and wherever they are demonstrated to be such?

Reasoning men can only accept the Apostles' Creed by putting aside their mentality, and this most of them are loth to do, and many will not do.

In a certain church in New York City, there is read each Sunday the following Creed :

“ We believe in the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ, and the immortality of the Soul.

“ We believe that goodness is the eternal law of God and will finally overcome all evil, and that only as we accept and practise this law, can we find peace in this World or in the World to come.”

Goodness! How grand is the word when we think of it! Place in one scale all the religious doctrines and dogmas that were ever invented, and in the opposite scale a few grains of Goodness, and compare their weight!

Why cannot Christian Unity be accomplished upon the basis of a statement of belief like the above? To me it seems impossible that it can ever come when it involves a belief or professed belief in the Apostles' Creed.

JOHN S. HAWLEY,  
Yonkers, N. Y.

The manuscript was returned on June 30th with the following letter from the editor, Dr. Abbott,

“THE OUTLOOK,”

287 FOURTH AVENUE,

NEW YORK.

*June 30, 1899.*

MY DEAR SIR:—

We return this manuscript to you, which we are not able to use. It asks many questions which I think, from my point of view, might be answered, but the answering of them would involve repeating again what we are constantly repeating in THE OUTLOOK, the reasons for our faith in the essential facts of historical Christianity. It is possible that those facts are not stated in this creed in their best proportion, but they state what is the

general belief of Christians, and state that belief in a form with which the great majority of Christians are familiar, and state it freed from metaphysical subtleties and refinements. This is the ground on which it seems to me useful to retain that creed as an expression of the historic faith of the Christian Church, although in some respects in forms which the Church of to-day would not use, if it were creating a new statement of its present belief.

Yours sincerely,

LYMAN ABBOTT.

(W.)

MR. JOHN S. HAWLEY.

When we consider the position which Dr. Abbott holds in the Christian world, through his fine talents, his opportunities, his great experience, and his acknowledged ability, it is easy to understand that his views and expressions deservedly carry unusual weight. It is therefore to be regretted that his response was not more complete.

Whatever may be said of the first of these letters, it is certain that Dr. Abbott's reply is not remarkable for its clearness or directness. On the contrary, it is distinctly evasive. It says the questions asked "might be answered, but the answering of them would involve repeating again what we are constantly repeating in THE OUTLOOK."

Though the writer has read THE OUTLOOK and its predecessor, the "Christian Union," for many years, he has no recollection of having seen the answers referred to.



Concerning the Apostles' Creed, Dr. Abbott twice expresses disapproval ; i. e., he says : " It is possible those facts are not stated in this creed in their best proportion." It might be interesting to know what changes he would make to state them in their " best proportion," whatever may be the intended meaning of that phrase.

Again he says of this creed that it is " in some respects in forms which the Church of to-day would not use, if it were creating a new statement of its present belief."

Though both of these quotations are obscure and incomplete, they seem to show that Dr. Abbott, while *desiring* to indorse the creed, is not entirely satisfied with it.

Why is this? Why is it that thousands of ministers and millions of religious people who use this creed do not give it their entire approval? There is but one answer and that is: *They do not sincerely believe it!*

It is a hopeful sign in the march of progressive thought when religious teachers will make such admissions as those referred to.

The historical value of the Apostles' Creed is very properly spoken of, for that appears to be its chief virtue. In most of its averments it has become obsolete. It seems to me that when a declaration of belief is found to be defective and incorrect, it has survived its real purpose and ought to be replaced.

There was a time when men were persecuted for expressing the smallest doubt as to the entire literal correctness of this creed. They were infidels, and it became the duty of the church to visit God's wrath upon them. To-day they are only accused of heresy, now scarcely recognized as being a punishable offense, except by excommunication, which is not often resorted to, and which has also become quite harmless.

To the consistent Catholic all Protestants are heretics; to the orthodox Protestant all who do not believe in the multitudinous doctrines of some of the various denominations, are heretics. Between the two the heretics have increased until their numbers alone make them quite respectable, aside from the fact that they include thousands of the most eminent scholars, the highest moralists, and the best thinkers of the Christian world.

## BELIEFS OF THE MOST PROMINENT RELIGIONS OF TO-DAY.

### BRAHMANISM AND BUDDHISM.

THE people of the East claim that their religious history extends back to a period far more remote than that claimed by either Christians or Jews. The Chinese have dates extending back more than twenty thousand years, the Hindoo also gives dates of great antiquity, but they are so obscured in tradition and legend, myth and doubt, as not to be reliable.

The Brahman Religion is of great antiquity. Its oldest books are known as the Vedas. The word, Veda, means "a breath from the Divine." To this day Brahmans believe that this Divine breath inspired the writers of their Vedas, and that therefore they are and always must be absolutely infallible.

They believe in innumerable gods, gods for everything in nature, as the god of the sky, god of the wind, god of the sun, god of fire, of the fields, of the trees and the flowers, etc., etc. Goddesses are also numerous, as the goddess of the dawn, etc., etc.

All the moral virtues are taught in the Vedas. Vice, dishonesty, untruthfulness, and all immorality are forbidden and condemned and are punished by the gods.

Buddha came into the Hindoo world many centuries after Brahma. He was a reformer, and his teachings were largely against what might have been called the ecclesiasticism of his day and surroundings. For a time Buddhism was the chief religion of India—but later Brahmanism regained the ascendancy, though its old caste restrictions and priestly rule were modified by the influence of Buddhism.

The Hindoos believe not only in many gods, but also in many devils, who bring into the world all diseases, sins, and evils that afflict humanity.

They have great reverence for certain animals, plants, and stones, and have numerous sacred places to which they make pilgrimages on certain occasions by thousands.

This people may fairly be said to be afflicted with excessive religion. To them their religious belief is far more important than knowledge, or even truth. By nature they are an intelligent race. Had their diligence in the pursuit of knowledge and truth been equal to the persistence with which they have clung to their mythical beliefs, who can say but that to-day they might have been among the foremost of the earth's nations!

Great efforts have been made and are being

made to convert the Brahmans to Christianity, but with comparatively small results. They cling to their idols, to their dogmas and doctrines! Can they consistently be blamed for this by Christians who with equal persistency cling to man-made dogmas and doctrines which are generally unscriptural, not provable, sometimes absolutely unreasonable, and often impossible?

#### CONFUCIANISM, THE RELIGION OF THE CHINESE.

Confucius was born about 550 years before the Christian era, in the Lu country of China. He was studious in his boyhood and a scholar while he was still a youth. At an early age he became, like his father, an officer of the government and was soon advanced to one of the highest positions in his state, distinguishing himself for great ability.

Not satisfied with this, he resigned his office, and for thirteen years devoted himself to study and observation, traveling over various parts of the Kingdom. He returned to Lu, and spent the remainder of his life in study, teaching, and revising and improving the "Kings," or Sacred Books of China.

So far as numbers are concerned, Confucius has had an influence over a greater number of human beings than any man of whom we have any account, and at the present time his religious and

moral teachings are embraced by probably thirty per cent. of the world's inhabitants.

Prior to the time of Confucius, the Chinese believed in one personal God whom they called Shang-te. He was believed to be the everlasting ruler of Heaven and Earth, controlling nations and individuals. By his command the good were rewarded and the wicked were punished. Although this deity is still worshipped by the Chinese, and their emperor in the name of the true believers makes solemn sacrifices to him, he is not considered essentially as a person, but rather as a condition or Heaven. The writings of Confucius do not embrace a belief in a personal God.

The Chinese have great regard for the spirits of the departed, especially the spirits of their ancestors, who, they believe, are continually watching over those they left behind, giving them good or evil fortune. They consult these spirits in all their affairs. Even in matters of State, conferences are supposed to be held with the spirits of deceased emperors, lawgivers, and wise men, above all with the spirit of Confucius.

Filial and brotherly love are distinguishing characteristics of the Chinese, and both these virtues are inculcated through their religious teachings.

Chinese women occupy a subordinate and a degraded position. To obey seems to be their only duty, and a woman is required to obey her parents and

the parents of her husband, her husband, and, if she is a widow, she must obey her eldest son.

Education is greatly respected and revered in China, and only from the educated can officials be chosen.

The following from the teachings of Confucius may well be studied and copied by those who lay claim to the highest civilization. "The superior man strives after nine things:

- 1st. In seeing—to see clearly.
- 2d. In hearing—to hear distinctly.
- 3d. In expression—to be benign.
- 4th. In his demeanor—to be decorous.
- 5th. In speaking—to be sincere.
- 6th. In his duties—to be respectful.
- 7th. In doubt—to inquire.
- 8th. In resentment—to think of difficulties.
- 9th. And when he sees an opportunity for gain—to think of right."

Jesus gave to Christians the Golden Rule. In like manner Confucius gave to his followers a similar general rule of life as follows: "What ye would not that men should do to you, do not ye do it to them."

Though stated in different words, in substance they are equal.

Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism are the three legal religions of China. Japan has two great religions, Shintoism and Buddhism, to one of which nearly all of its people belong. To

describe all the teachings, doctrines, dogmas and religious customs of the people of the East, would require volumes of research and study, and would be far beyond the scope of this little book.

#### MOHAMMEDANISM.

Another great teacher of the half-civilized people of our little globe, was Mahomet or Mohammed.

This man was born at Mecca, Arabia, A. D. 571. He was of poor parentage, though of a noble branch of his tribe. In youth he was of a serious, meditative, and religious temperament. Early in life he claimed to have been visited by the Angel Gabriel, who commanded him to preach and instruct the people. The Angel took him from his house in Mecca to Jerusalem and thence to Heaven, where he received his revelations from God himself. The more ignorant of the Mohammedans believe that the prophet went to Heaven in his physical body, while others say it was in spirit.

Most of the Koran, or Bible of the Mohammedans, was written by men under the teaching of Mahomet, but much of it is from ancient traditions of the Arabs and from the Bible.

The Koran contains 114 Suras, or Chapters. They were written by various men and at different times and contain much that is contradictory and inconsistent, but these contradictions and incon-



sistencies are deftly harmonized by Mohammedan theologians, who teach that every word of the Koran is divinely inspired.

“There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet,” is the continuous exclamation of the good Moslem.

They believe in one God, the Eternal One, the Creator and Ruler of everything; that he is attended by pure angels; and that there will be a final resurrection of the dead.

They believe in a hell to which the wicked will be condemned, while the good will be rewarded in paradise.

Jesus is recognized in the Koran as divine, but not as a deity; not as the Son of God.

The Koran commands Mohammedans to pray. One of their prayers corresponds with the Lord's Prayer. It is as follows:

“In the name of the Most Merciful God. Praise be to God, the Lord of all creatures, the most merciful, the King of the day of judgment. Thee do we worship, and of Thee do we beg assistance. Direct us in the right way, in the way of those to whom Thou hast been gracious, not of those against whom Thou art incensed, nor of those who go astray.”

All Mohammedans believe in God's absolute foreknowledge and predestination.

Feasts, fasts, and pilgrimages innumerable, are among their religious duties. In these feasts,

animals are sacrificed as in the days of Mosaic law. Camels, sheep, and goats are used for this purpose.

There are many different sects among the Mohammedans, who argue and dispute one with another on minor points of belief. Some of the more rude tribes practise Devil worship. They regard diseases as manifestations of an evil spirit having control of the sick.

Brahmanism, Confucianism, and Mohammedanism, here so hastily and imperfectly sketched, form, with Christianity, the four great religions of the world, and embrace probably nine-tenths of its inhabitants.

We have very briefly outlined the beliefs of the people of the East.

What do Christians say of them? That they are merely delusions, errors, falsities, foundationless inventions of man, and the believers in such religions are only heathen!

In this connection it may be interesting to consider what may be the impressions of the more intelligent of these same people concerning us.

Here is an example in the comments of Arai Hakuseki, a very intelligent Japanese gentleman, as given in the Boston Transcript (Aug. 4, 1899) translated from the German of Dr. L. Lonholm, professor in the university of Tokio.

“The teaching of the West (Europe) says that heaven and earth and all things could not have

come into existence of themselves, but that there necessarily must have been in existence a Being who created them. If, however, the idea that nothing can come into existence of itself be correct, the question naturally arises, Who created God? If, however, God came into existence of Himself, why could not earth and heaven have come into existence of themselves?

“It sounds like childish talk when the followers of the foreign teaching say that the breaking of God’s command by Adam and Eve was such a great sin that they themselves could not expiate it, but that three thousand years afterward God was obliged to appear upon earth in the person of Jesus Christ and expiate the sin Himself. Whoever gives a command, has also the power to forgive the breaking of that command. What then stood in the way of His pardoning its infraction, especially as the whole misdeed consisted merely in the eating of an apple? Was it necessary for God to become man in connection with so insignificant an affair?’

“The teaching of the West also says that God sent a great flood upon the earth and therein were all mankind drowned, with the exception of Noah and his family. But if God is the creator of all things and their great Prince and Father, what reason had He for destroying His own creation? Why did He not make man in the beginning good and obedient to his teaching? If He did not

have the power to do this, how came it that He had the power to create the world? And if mankind, on the other hand, was created so stupid as not to understand the teaching of God, was this so great a sin on his part that God, the Creator and Father of all things, should have destroyed mankind?’

“ Sidotti, having described to Arai the European custom of crossing one’s self when meeting another person, and having explained that the purpose of this custom was to protect the individual against lightning, the devil, and other like things, Arai remarked: ‘ It is very wonderful that God, the Christian God, should first have created lightning, the devil, and similar bad things, and then have taught mankind how to protect themselves against these things. It would have been much simpler and surer not to have created lightning and the devil at all. In regard to the supernatural, the Christians appear to be upon the same low level as the common people here in Japan.’ ”

. . . . .

Possibly one-tenth of the world’s inhabitants is made up of the savages of Africa, North and South America, and the “ Islands of the Sea.”

Even in the most benighted of these, there is implanted a belief in God and a future life, a belief as strong as is found among the most intelligent.

Is not this almost universal belief as much a creation as is the physical body or the mind?

#### HEBRAISM.

The Jews number about ten millions of souls and are distributed throughout the whole inhabited globe. They reject the New Testament and found their beliefs upon the Old, though greatly modified from what was their faith in the ancient days, as shown, for example, in the fact that the sacrifices commanded in the Mosaic Law are no longer practised.

A full account of the Jews would be one of the most interesting of histories, for they have been, in very important respects, the leaders of the world.

To-day they are distinguished for their charities, their devotion to their homes and families, and their attachment to their friends. They are excellent, law-abiding citizens. Not often do you see a Jew drunkard or beggar or burglar or murderer.

They are especially talented in driving a bargain, and this accounts for much of the unreasonable prejudice that exists against them. At the same time those who condemn them most for this are the very ones that would imitate them in dickering, if they could!

Another cause of the prejudice that exists

against the Jew is illustrated in the anecdote of the Irishman who had whipped a Jew.

“Why did you do it?” he was asked.

“That man is a Jew,” replied Pat.

“Well, what of it?”

“The Jews killed Christ,” was the reply.

“Yes, but that was more than eighteen hundred years ago.”

“Never mind,” said Pat, “I only heard it to-day.”

Are we really much in advance of Pat?

But perhaps I am leaving my subject.

The Jew has given to the world the Bible! Who can say what the world would have been without it? Bible nations are unquestionably leaders in all that is progressive. Where it is most read and studied, there is the greatest condition of intelligence; and wherever it is not read and studied ignorance prevails. In countries where it is unknown you will find barbarism, or at best a half-civilization. The best laws, the best liberty, the best intelligence is found in Bible-reading countries.

Let me quote a few lines from Rabbi Edward N. Kalisch: “The Bible above all things is for human guidance, human help and assistance. Its lessons are the lessons of human life, and its heroes, therefore, are human. The presence of the faults and the follies of its great men is doubly creditable to the writers of the Scriptures. It shows

the absolute fidelity and accuracy with which they chronicled events. Naught was set down in malice, naught glossed over, naught extenuated. When a sin was committed, it was not hidden or condoned. Often its punishment was given by its side. Noah is rebuked by the conduct of his sons. Jacob feels the humiliation of his acts, when, twenty years later, he meets Esau again. Miriam was struck with leprosy; the great law-giver and leader was not permitted to cross the Jordan. The intrepid Nathan stood before the monarch who had sinned, and flung the reproach into his face.

“By these very things does the Bible press home to us the lesson of our human and our God-like being. These men were heroes and leaders. They sinned, yes; and by the very reason that they rose superior to their sins are they strong. The true strength lies not in never having fallen, but in rising after one has given way. ‘Though a righteous man falls seven times, yet will he rise again.’ Had the heroes of the Bible been flawless, stainless, immaculate, perfect, they would not appeal to us as they do. That they were weak, we know them to be our brothers, fighting the same battles of lust, passion, temptation and allure-ment; that they conquered their weaknesses and rose to the sublime heights of moral truth, aye, to the very summit and acme of spiritual life and conception, teaches us that we too have these God-

like possibilities within us; we too can and will climb the Moriah of obedience, the Sinai of a steadfast loyalty, the Nebo of sublime resignation, and by our moral strength defeat and destroy the weaknesses of our moral garments.

“ For this reason, too, let us be wary in stern judgment. The human being is compassed by too many limitations to be perfect. Perfection is only of God. Indefectibility can only be of that omniscient One whose power permeates the worlds, whose mercy is as fathomless as His wisdom. Striving to be, if to an infinitesimal degree, like Him, in purity of thought and deed, let us, like Him, also remember the weakness of men, and be generous in thought, kindly in speech, slow in condemnation, but swift to approve where approval may be had. As the best tempered metal is flexible, so the true story of human endeavor is not that of rigid and inflexible indefectibility, but in the recuperative power of the soul that saves and raises us, though we have fallen seven times. There can be no greater weakness than that which denies all weakness. It is folly for us to consider ourselves flawless. We know our weaknesses. We cannot hide them by, ostrich-like, hiding our heads in the sand heaps of self-interested flattery. ‘ There is no man who may not sin,’ and no people; for a people is but a number of men. We know our faults and sins as a people, our cruel coldness to our faith, our heartless



indifference to its needs, our deafness to its calls, our shamefacedness in acknowledgment of it, our avoidance of its duties and obligations; our selfish, cruelly selfish, disregard of all that crosses our convenience or our pleasures.

“There is greater crime in knowing and continuing these faults than in the faults themselves. You have fallen. Raise yourselves up. The heroes of the Bible have shown the pathway. Be ye heroes, not in never having fallen, but, fallen, in raising yourselves up; for the righteous man is not he who has never fallen, but he who has risen up, though fallen seven times.”

The charitable works of the Jews are among the grandest in the world. There is no limit to what more might be said of the Jews, but this little book has not the required space. Are they justly to be blamed to-day, because their ancestors eighteen hundred years ago, put to death one whom they regarded as a heretic? Not more so than Christians of to-day should be blamed because in the dark ages Christian Theology, for the same cause, burned thousands at the stake. Crimes like these are things of the unenlightened past, thank God! To-day, educated and intelligent Jews are, in every essential, the equals of educated and intelligent Christians!

#### CHRISTIANITY

In a work so brief as this, it is impossible to

give a history of Christianity that would do the subject justice, or be of any substantial value to any of our readers. There are numerous works on this great subject that may easily be obtained by all who wish to inform themselves. We shall say but a few words.

The Acts tell us that the disciples of Jesus were first called Christians in the City of Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas passed a whole year teaching the people. But little is known of Christian organization or work during the early centuries of the Christian era. It is believed that, at first, only the simplest and plainest precepts of Jesus were accepted or taught. Later came doctrines, theories, and dogmas, such as the dogma of the Trinity, the doctrines of the fall of man, the Atonement, the Incarnation, the worship of the Virgin Mary and of the Saints, and the infallibility of the Pope. Still later sprang up innumerable doctrines, such as purgatory, adoption, sanctification, justification, saving faith, effectual calling, election, etc., etc. All of which are the inventions of men and rest upon foundations that are chiefly guess-work.

Councils and conferences assembled, composed of the "Fathers," which comprised the bishops and priests of the dark ages. Each brought in his especial scheme. Many were adopted and more were rejected, for which last the Christian world cannot be too thankful.

The doctrine of the Trinity was first proclaimed by the Councils of Nice (A. D. 325) and at Constantinople (A. D. 381), which declared that the Son and Spirit are co-equal with the Father, the Son begotten by the Father and the Spirit proceeding from the Father.

At Toledo, however (A. D. 589), it was declared that the Holy Ghost proceeded also from the Son.

The word Trinity, or its equivalent, is not found in the Bible, and texts that are relied upon in support of the dogma are susceptible of various meanings.

Until the fourth century the books which compose the Bible, were known as "Scripture" or "Scriptures"—(writings).

Chrysostom first gave these writings the name, Bible. Historically speaking, the origin of the books comprising the Old Testament are as obscure as the "Vedas" of the Hindoos or the "Kings," or sacred books, of the Chinese.

Moses is, of course, the chief character of the Old Testament. He is said to have been the author of the first five books; though this is plainly impossible, as they contain the account of his death, and naturally he *could not* himself have written this. The other books of the Old Testament are ascribed with more or less correctness to various authors. Inspiration is claimed for all of these authors. But no man can explain how an

All Wise and All Loving Father could have inspired Moses to write the 31st Chapter of Numbers or David to write the 109th Psalm !

*Read these chapters*, and then endeavor to harmonize them with the spirit of true Religion. Any honest or fair man must pronounce the task utterly and entirely impossible !

*Numbers, Chapter XXXI.*

“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites, afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people.

“And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, and avenge the Lord of Midian.

“Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war.

“So there were delivered out of the thousands of Israel, a thousand of every tribe, twelve thousand armed for war.

“And Moses sent them to the war, a thousand of every tribe, them and Phinehas the son of Eleazar, the priest, to the war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpets to blow in his hand.

“And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males.

“And they slew the kings of Midian, beside the rest of them that were slain; namely, Evi, and Rekem, and Zur, and Hur, and Reba, five kings of Midian: Balaam also the son of Beor they slew with the sword.

“ And the children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods.

“ And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles with fire.

“ And they took all the spoil, and all the prey, both of men and of beasts.

“ And they brought the captives, and the prey, and the spoil unto Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the camp at the plains of Moab, which are by Jordan near Jericho.

“ And Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp.

“ And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, with the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle.

“ And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive?

“ Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord.

“ Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him.

“ But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.\*

\* Just at this time the Boers, overcome in war, are at the mercy of the English.

Suppose that the British commander (claiming to act under divine inspiration), treated those poor people as Moses treated

. . . “ And the booty, being the rest of the prey which the men of war had caught, was six hundred thousand and seventy thousand and five thousand sheep.

“ And threescore and twelve thousand beeves.

“ And threescore and one thousand asses.

“ And thirty and two thousand persons, in all, of women that had not known man by lying with him.”

*Psalms CIX.*

“ Hold not thy peace, O God of my praise ;

“ For the mouth of the wicked and the mouth of the deceitful are opened against me : they have spoken against me with a lying tongue.

“ They compassed me about also with words of hatred ; and fought against me without a cause.

“ For my love they are my adversaries : but I give myself unto prayer.

“ And they have rewarded me evil for good, and hatred for my love.

“ Set thou a wicked man over him : and let Satan stand at his right hand.

“ When he shall be judged, let him be condemned : and let his prayer become sin.

“ Let his days be few ; and let another take his office.

“ Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow.

“ Let his children be continually vagabonds, and beg : let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places.

the Midianites—what would Christendom and Humanity say to it?

Yet it is *said* that Moses acted by the direct command of God !  
What a libel on the Eternal Goodness.

“ Let the extortioner catch all that he hath ; and let the strangers spoil his labor.

“ Let there be none to extend mercy unto him : neither let there be any to favor his fatherless children.

“ Let his posterity be cut off ; and in the generation following let their name be blotted out.

“ Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the Lord ; and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out.

“ Let them be before the Lord continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth.

“ Because that he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man, that he might even slay the broken in heart.

“ As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him : as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.

“ As he clothed himself with cursing like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones.

“ Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually.

“ Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul.

“ But do thou for me, O God the Lord, for thy name's sake : because thy mercy is good, deliver thou me.

“ For I am poor and needy, and my heart is wounded within me.

“ I am gone like the shadow when it declineth : I am tossed up and down as the locust.

“ My knees are weak through fasting; and my flesh faileth of fatness.

“ I became also a reproach unto them: when they looked upon me they shook their heads.

“ Help me, O Lord my God: O save me according to thy mercy:

“ That they may know that this is thy hand; that thou, Lord, hast done it.

“ Let them curse, but bless thou; when they arise, let them be ashamed; but let thy servant rejoice.

“ Let mine adversaries be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion, as with a mantle.

“ I will greatly praise the Lord with my mouth; yea, I will praise him among the multitude.

“ For he shall stand at the right hand of the poor, to save him from those that condemn his soul.”

There is no consistency between the barbarity and the savage hatred set forth in these chapters, and the true theory of an All Wise, All Seeing, All Merciful, and All Powerful God! One need not be a theologian to exclaim, “NEVER!”

Far be it from me to acclaim against the higher teachings of that grand old book, the Bible. But we cannot, nor need not, shut our eyes to the fact, that, strangely mingled with these higher teachings, there is much that is the work of unlettered savagery. The two chapters to which I have called attention are but samples of many more that might be referred to.



David is said to be the author of one of them. If so, it hardly marks him as divinely inspired above other historical characters. It proves him to have been like other men, a mixture of good and evil. Though there was much of good in David, there was also much of evil, for the Bible tells us he was an adulterer and a murderer! I do not write this from choice, but because we are dealing in facts.

It cannot injure you to see the truth. Men of David's time were not inspired above men who have lived and are living in the nineteenth century.

Let the literal believer in the absolute infallibility and inerrancy of the Bible, re-read these chapters before he again proclaims his perfect faith in the inspired truth, justice, wisdom, and beauty of everything contained in the Book! Clearly they teach vindictiveness, revenge, and barbaric cruelty! Is it justice or even fairness toward our Heavenly Father, to believe that He ever authorized such infamous teachings? No! No! No!

The Bible has been translated and re-translated many times. Necessarily from this cause passages have many times been differently rendered and, in some instances, meanings changed. The version now most generally used in England and the United States is known as the King James version. It was the work of forty-seven English divines between the years 1606 and 1611.

This was revised about twenty years ago, by the labor of over one hundred of the most eminent scholars, about two-thirds of whom were English and the remaining third American.

These learned men found in the King James version thousands of errors, most of them involving little change in meaning, but, on the other hand, some of great importance. In one instance a whole verse was interpolated. It is this: 1st John, 5th Chapter, 7th verse. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost and these three are one."

Modern scholars find no authority for this verse. It is clearly an insertion—the work of translators, who took this method of placing a support under the top-heavy doctrine of the Trinity.

While we are writing of this subject, let us say there are three distinct objections to the doctrine of the Trinity.

1st. It is unreasonable,

2nd. It is unscriptural!

3rd. It is impossible!

The claim that there are "three persons in the Godhead" is the invention of men whose aim was only to make religion complex, intricate, and mysterious. Jesus never said anything about three persons in the Godhead. If it were true, He was one of the persons and must have known it. He was silent as to the composition of the "Godhead." Every text that might be said to

support such a teaching is ambiguous, while there are numerous texts to prove that He believed in one Heavenly Father, one only God!

“As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.”

“My Father is greater than I.”

“The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the works.”

And He taught us to pray to “our Father.”

The doctrine of the Trinity invites the ridicule of many earnest, thinking men. Here is a specimen of this from the pen of a man alike distinguished for intelligence, honesty, and wit. “According to the faith, each of these three persons is God. Christ is his own Father and his own son. The Holy Ghost is neither father nor son, but both. The son was begotten by the father, but existed before he was begotten, just the same before as after. Christ is just as old as his father and the father is just as young as the son. The Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, but was equal to the Father and Son before he proceeded, that is to say before he existed, but he is of the same age of the other two, and is their equal in power and glory. So it is declared that the Father is God, and the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and that these three Gods make one God.

“According to the celestial multiplication table,

once one is three, and three times one is one, and according to theological subtraction, if we take two from three, three are left. The addition is equally peculiar, if we add two to one, we have but one. Each one is equal to himself and the other two. Nothing ever was, nothing ever can be, more perfectly idiotic or absurd than the dogma of the Trinity.

“How is it possible to prove the existence of the Trinity?”

“Is it possible for a human being who has been born but once, to comprehend, or to imagine the existence of three beings, each of whom is equal to the three?”

“Think of one of these beings as the father of one, and think of that one as half human and all God, and think of the third as having proceeded from the other two and then think of all three as one, think that after the father begot the son the father was still alone, and after the Holy Ghost proceeded from the father and the son, the father was still alone, because there never was and never will be but one God.

“At this point absurdity has reached its limit.”  
(See Athanasian Creed in chapter on Episcopalianism.)

Trinity is inevitably a target for just such derision; and the great trouble is, people are apt to infer that this is ridiculing religion, when in fact it only applies to an absurd dogma.

If the doctrine of the Trinity belonged to the Chinese or the Hindoos, we should consider this quotation as droll and amusing, but, at the same time, logical and correct. But, as it is the property of Christian theology, it will be characterized as sacrilege, or blasphemy, or infidelity, or all three together, according to the bias of the reader.

Theology, however, does not appraise Trinity quite as highly as an asset, as it did twenty-five years ago, It is steadily decreasing in value and before many more years have passed, it will be placed in the divinity museum, along with ghosts and goblins, witchcraft and mythology.

A word as to inspiration, which is claimed by each of the four great religions of the world, and as belonging exclusively to their own system of faith. Proof is as abundant and as deficient, as applied to either. The teachings of Brahma, Confucius, and Buddha are superior to the teachings of Moses. All who study them without prejudice, must admit this.

Perhaps the truth is all mankind is inspired; the difference being only in degree. There is as much reason to believe that Luther and Milton and Shakespeare and Macaulay were inspired, as to believe that inspiration belonged to Moses or Ezekiel or David. "God is no respecter of persons."

Why should we not read the Bible as we read

any other book, as history, or as poetry, or as a work on any branch of science?

Has not our Creator given us reason and the capacity to judge for ourselves? Are we not to make use of these God-given powers? Where is the command that we should not use these faculties as well in spiritual as in secular things? Is it not even more important? The command is, "Search the Scriptures." *What is the use of searching, if we are not to come to conclusions through our examinations?* Where is the propriety in our being compelled to accept "doctrines" that were formulated by the ignorance and superstition of the "Fathers?" Why should the car of human progress be stopped or stayed in spiritual things more than in matters of discovery or science?

These are all questions for our readers to consider fairly and seriously. They should never be ignored or set aside.

Read, study, and reflect on the Bible. Draw from it that which is good. In your examinations, you will certainly find many contradictions, much that is pernicious and false. Crimes and savage cruelties are commanded and indorsed by God himself, and barbarous sins and atrocities are accounted as righteousness.

It will not hurt you, nor need it disturb your faith; if you read aright, it will confirm and

strengthen it. TRUTH injures no one. It looks serenely down upon doctrines and dogmas.

A grand Bible is being written to-day. It is all about us. It is in the invisible air we breathe. It shines from the sun and stars. It looks down upon us from the mountain top. It is developed in the budding leaf and in the opening flower. Not a blade of grass, but that has its lesson for us to read. All nature is ever telling us of the wisdom, power, and grandeur of the great Creator in whom "we live and move and have our being."

The Bible of Nature is, always has been, and always will be open to all. It admits of no error, misinterpretation, or misunderstanding. In it, we read of and see God's power, without having to depend on what was said or written by men hundreds or thousands of years ago.

We may indeed take our lessons from the natural. If we depend upon the supernatural, we shall be, as man always has been, disappointed. There is absolutely no substantial evidence that anything supernatural ever happened. Theology asserts it, but never has and never will be able to prove or demonstrate it.

Was there ever such a thing as a miracle, as commonly taught and believed?

Were miracles necessary in the ancient times?

Are they not equally necessary at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Are many people still looking for them?

Does science or intelligence expect them?

It seems unfortunate that among Christians, there should be so much divergence of belief. If Catholicism is true and right, then, in some respects, Protestantism must be false and wrong; and *vice versa*.

In like manner, among Protestants; if one denomination or sect is correct, it follows necessarily that the others are in error. Think of an Episcopalian missionary and a Presbyterian missionary, each calling to a poor heathen: "Come in here! This is the place! We will teach you the truth!" The confused heathen stares first at one and then at the other; decides perhaps that both are lunatics, and goes about his business.

Complex and inharmonious dogmas, doctrines and small theories, are only stumbling-blocks to the heathen, and obstacles to the spread of Christianity. The pure, simple, unembellished teachings of Jesus—goodness, kindness, and love—would be far better.

#### ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

In many respects the history of the Catholic Church down to the time of the Reformation is the history of Christianity.

It is not within the sphere of this small book to take up such a history. Libraries are filled with



volumes on this subject. It will only be noticed that for the first three centuries Christian teaching was simple and wonderfully progressive. Then came extended organization, and this involved the invention of all manner of dogma and doctrine, good, indifferent, and bad ; but mostly bad.

Priests, Bishops, and Popes became in too many instances debased and corrupt. Especially was this true of many of the Popes, who often dethroned, imprisoned, tortured, starved, and murdered each other, and all in the professed name of Christianity !

Under some of the Popes, the papal palace was little better than a brothel. And yet it was, and is claimed and believed, that the Popes were, and are, the successors of St. Peter and the vicars of Christ !

Undoubtedly there were among them many good men ; but not one reformer, nor one progressive man ! Their tendency seemed to be from bad to worse until the year 1520, when Martin Luther, unable longer to bear their iniquities (principally the sale of indulgences, that gave the buyer immunity from crime), began that glorious movement, the Reformation.

For accounts and descriptions of the character of the Popes during the dark ages, see "Gibbon's Rome," or "Draper's History of the Intellectual Development of Europe."

Lest some may think our estimate of the Popes

who ruled the Church during the dark ages, is unjust or unfair we will quote a few sentences from the last mentioned authority.

“From 896 to 900, five Popes were consecrated. Leo V., who succeeded in 904, in less than two months after he became Pope, was cast into prison by Christopher, one of his chaplains. This Christopher usurped his place and in a little while was expelled from Rome by Sergius III., who became Pope in 905. This Pope lived in criminal intercourse with the celebrated Theodora, who with her daughters, Marozia and Theodora, both prostitutes, exercised an extraordinary control over him. The love of Theodora was also shared by John X. She gave him first the Archbishopric of Ravenna, and made him Pope in 915. The daughter of Theodora overthrew this Pope. She surprised him in the Lateran Palace. His brother Peter was killed and the Pope was thrown into prison, where he was afterward murdered. Afterward, this Marozia, daughter of Theodora, made her own son, Pope John XI. Many affirmed that Pope Sergius was his father, *but his mother inclined to attribute him to her husband, Alberic*, whose brother Guido, she afterward married. Another of her sons, Alberic, jealous of his brother John, the Pope, cast him and their mother into prison. Alberic’s son was then elected Pope as John XII.

“John was nineteen years old when he became

the 'Vicar of Christ.' His reign was characterized by the most shocking immoralities, so that the Emperor, Otho I., was compelled by the German clergy to interfere. He was tried. It appeared that John had received bribes for the consecration of bishops; that he had ordained one who was only ten years old; that he was charged with incest, and with so many adulteries that the Lateran Palace had become a brothel. He put out the eyes of one ecclesiastic; he maimed another; both dying in consequence of their injuries. He was deposed at last and Leo VIII. elected in his stead. Subsequently he got the upper hand. He seized his antagonists; he cut off the hand of one, the nose, the finger, and the tongue of others. His life was eventually brought to an end, by the vengeance of a man whose wife he had seduced.

"John XIII. (the next Pope) was strangled in prison. Boniface VII. imprisoned Benedict VII. and starved him to death. John XIV. was secretly put to death in the dungeons of the castle of St. Angelo. The corpse of Boniface was dragged through the streets by the populace.

"Pope John XVI. was seized; his eyes put out, his nose cut off, his tongue torn from his mouth, and he was sent through the streets mounted on an ass, with his face to the tail. Benedict IX., a boy of less than twelve years of age, was raised to the apostolic throne. One of his successors, Victor III., declared that the life of Benedict was so

shameful, so foul, so execrable, that he shuddered to describe it. He ruled like a captain of banditti. The people, unable to bear longer his adulteries his homicides, and his abominations, rose against him, and in despair of maintaining his position, he put the papacy up at auction and it was bought by a Presbyterian named John, who became Gregory VI. in the year of grace 1045."

Going back a little in the same history, we find this: "Formosus, who had been excommunicated as a conspirator for the murder of Pope John, was himself elected Pope in 891. Boniface was his successor. He had been deposed from the diaconate and from the priesthood for his immoral and lewd life. Stephen VII. was the next Pope, and he had the dead body of Formosus taken from the grave, clothed in papal habiliments, propped up in a chair and tried before a Council! The corpse was found guilty, three fingers were cut off, and the body cast into the Tiber. Afterward, Stephen VII. was himself thrown into prison and strangled."

Can the imagination conceive of anything more ungodly, more un-Christlike, more immoral, more fiendish, or more utterly barbarous than the foregoing? And yet the Catholic Church modestly puts forth the claim that "the Pontiffs are the greatest statesmen and rulers that the world has ever seen!"

Let our readers draw their own conclusions, we

simply give the facts. It would certainly be unjust to condemn all the Popes, because some of them were vicious, and most certainly it would be unfair to censure the Catholic Church, because it has been wronged by some of its leaders—leaders whose savage acts no good Catholic of to-day would for an instant endorse. On the contrary, no man or body of men would repudiate them more earnestly, nor condemn them with greater severity.

What we have said and quoted is simply to show those, who claim and believe that everything in the Catholic Church is good and perfect, that they mistake. No church that has ever existed can substantiate such a claim.

Turning from the Popes, we may refer to the cruelties that were perpetrated during the Crusades; the Mohammedans and Christians vying with each other in all that was barbarous and savage.

In the first of the Crusades, a great rabble was assembled under ignorant leaders, like Peter the Hermit, and Walter the Penniless. It was called an army, but was really a great mob of fanatics, to whom the clergy had promised the divine protection. Hideous failure was the result, scores of thousands perishing by sickness, starvation, and the sword of the Mohammedans. In the First Crusade more than half a million of men died, but it never even approached the city it expected to capture.

Subsequently Jerusalem was taken by a somewhat better organized expedition. This was attended with atrocities almost incredible, too horrible to describe, in which nearly 70,000 persons, men, women, and children, were massacred, the church authorities "partaking in the triumph!"

There were in all eight crusades, all of which were stimulated and encouraged by the Church. Millions of lives were sacrificed, under conditions and circumstances that were barbarous and savage beyond description. And yet these Crusades were called "holy wars." The ignorant fanatics who formed the armies were promised heavenly rewards, and the greatest criminals looked upon the service as an expiation for all their crimes.

The Inquisition was established during the time of Pope Gregory IX. (1227 to 1241.) He placed it in charge of the Dominicans, an order especially founded for the punishment of the crime of heresy. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse adopted a number of canons for the purpose of giving permanence to the Inquisition. It was ordained that in every parish, a priest and three laymen should be appointed to search out heretics. Any person who in any manner shielded a heretic, was to be punished by forfeiture of land, personal property, and official position. Houses in which heretics were found were to be destroyed. Those accused or suspected of heresy were to be excluded from medical attendance. Men from the age of four-

teen and women from the age of twelve were to make oath (and renew it every two years), that they would inform on heretics. The laity were strictly prohibited from having the Holy Scriptures.

In 1252 Pope Innocent IV. sanctioned the use of torture against heresy. Burning alive was the usual form of capital punishment, though in some mitigated cases the condemned were strangled before burning.

The Inquisition was used in Germany for a brief time only, and its power was destroyed by the Reformation. In Italy, it was somewhat more severe, until it was abolished by Napoleon in 1808. Pope Pius VII. restored it in 1814, and it existed until 1870 and was only extinguished when Italy was ruled by a king instead of a pope.

In Spain and the Netherlands, however, its savage barbarities were practised to the fullest extent. In the first named country four days after the first edict, six condemned heretics were burned. The nobility were threatened with deprivation of title and property if they failed to obey the orders of the Inquisition! The dead were accused and convicted, and their bodies were dug up and burned. The tyrannical rulers worked in harmony with the Inquisition, for both felt themselves in danger from the spread of intelligence.

Thomas Torquemada was appointed to the holy

office of Inquisitor-General of Spain and under his administration it is said that 9,000 heretics were burned alive! Many times this number were imprisoned, tortured, and punished in other ways.

The Inquisition continued in Spain until 1808, when it was abolished by Napoleon. Slovente estimated that there had been burned alive 31,912 persons, and that severe punishments of other kinds had been inflicted upon 291,456 others, including all of the most savage tortures that human ingenuity could invent. These estimates may be somewhat extreme. Roman Catholic authorities claim that not more than 4,000 were burned alive.

The Church party claimed that the Inquisition was necessary *for the preservation of religion!* They succeeded in again establishing it in 1826, but it was finally abolished in 1834.

In the Netherlands, the cruelties practised were even worse than in Spain. Motley says: "The number of Netherlanders burned, strangled, beheaded, or buried alive, in obedience to the edict of Charles V., has been placed as high as 100,000 by distinguished authorities, and has never been put at a lower mark than 50,000."

It is proper to say that in this terrible slaughter, politics went hand in hand with the Inquisition, the despotic Charles doing, in the name of the Church, what he dared not do from mere motives of political hatred. Nor was he alone in this.



Other tyrants of those times, used the name of religion as an instrument of revenge upon their foes.

I have spoken of the baseness of some of the Popes of the middle ages, of the fanaticism and unreasoning folly which inaugurated and carried on the Crusades, and of the indescribable cruelties of the Inquisition; but I have only done so because they are historic facts, and should be taken into consideration in our estimates of the value of historic Christianity.

There are those who are inclined to hold Catholics of the present day responsible for their church evils of past ages. This is unjust and wrong, and Catholics naturally and very properly resent it. We must remember that in the benighted times, during which these dismal atrocities were enacted, the standards of morality and religion were entirely different from those of the present day.

In England and Ireland, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Catholics were outrageously persecuted by the Protestants. But Englishmen of the present day cannot justly be held responsible for the cruel acts of their ancestors generations ago.

John Calvin instigated the burning of Servetus for his opinions! Presbyterians cannot be held responsible for this.

Likewise it should be remembered that in those

days, trivial offenses were often punished with great severity. Until about a hundred years ago men were hung in England for stealing sheep!

Two or three centuries ago, thousands and thousands of women in Germany were burned for the crime of witchcraft! Men were also burned for this crime, and, in a few cases, children of seven years and upward!

In Scotland similar barbarities occurred. To come nearer home, under the same accusations, women were burned alive for witchcraft at Salem, in the State of Massachusetts, in 1791 and 1792!

But while Catholics of the present day are blameless for the occurrences of the dark ages, they, together with Protestants, both orthodox and liberal, may look back with wonder that such atrocities were sanctioned or even permitted by a Church that had its foundations in the teachings of Jesus, and whose power practically controlled all the nations of Europe!

Why did she permit this condition of barbarity? Why had she not developed in virtue, in justice, in morality, and in intelligence as she had in influence and power?

The answer is clear and plain. She suffered then from the same cause that hampers and retards her to-day, *the spirit of unprogressiveness!* The Church has in almost everything opposed progress. She is and has been the opponent of discovery, of science, of liberty, and of intelligence!

She has always turned a deaf ear to reason and argument and, as far as possible, closed her eyes to the developments that were going on around her! All that she has permitted of progress, has come to her from without; nothing from within.

So with the people she most closely controls, as for example, Italy and Spain! The Church does not help them toward intelligence and progress; what they gain in these things, comes from outside sources.

No one owes more to Luther and the Reformation, *than the Catholic Church*. It was a prod from the outside, that woke her up and forced upon her the realization that she must discontinue some, at least, of her vile practises.

With her hide-bound conservatism, the Church would have been burning her opponents and the Pope would have been selling indulgences to-day had it not been for the Reformation!

My Catholic friends, wake up to an appreciation of the value of progressive thought! Go forward with the intelligence of the world! Let progress and improvement come from your center, rather than have it forced upon you from the circumference! Investigate and discover the cause of the non-progressiveness of your people, and when you have detected it, remove it. Adopt advanced thought as it shall prove its truth! What is the value of conservatism, of tradition, doctrine, dogma,

of historical Christianity, when compared with truth?

In a recent number of the North American Review (Dec., 1899), is an article on the confessional in the Catholic Church, written by a priest. It is a very careful and able presentation of the subject from the Church's point of view. Its whole tone of earnestness bears evidence of the honesty of its author, and I do not for one moment question his perfect sincerity. But I differ entirely from him in his deductions and conclusions.

The average Catholic seems to believe that when he or she has been to confession and received from the priest what they are pleased to call absolution, his or her score is wiped off the slate; they now begin with a new record. How easy it was after all! Not half as bad as a call upon the dentist and the extraction of an offending molar!

A fortnight later, they call again and get a similar relief.

Ah! *by what authority* can any man say to another directly or indirectly "thy sins are forgiven?"

There is *no such power in priest or bishop, cardinal or pope!*

Our friend, the author of the article referred to, says: "I have myself often heard, from the lips of those who had told me some sad tale of wilful and long continued sin, the joyful exclamation, 'Now father, I begin to feel better.' The

inexpressible relief was due, in great measure, to the mere outpouring of their sad story."

They were also, it should be remembered, greatly encouraged toward again committing the same sin, and coming again, "outpouring their sad story." That is the logical and natural result.

Far better than relief through confession teach them the immutable truth, that neither through the confession, the priest, nor the Church, can man ever escape or evade the just consequences of his wrong-doing! "The kingdom of God is within you," and through that kingdom alone, can your forgiveness, your reconciliation come.

Here is another example of the working of the confessional, told to me by my niece, who was born in Guatemala. A poor native there had stolen a chicken. He confessed this, and the priest reprimanded him for his sin and charged him that he must say the pater-noster five times as penance. This he did, and felt entirely relieved. Subsequently he stole two chickens, and then repeated the pater-noster ten times, feeling that he had the authority of the priest, for concluding, that if one chicken equaled five pater-nosters, clearly two chickens equaled ten!

Superstition is still a dark spot on the Catholic Church. It always has been and still is taught to her people, a deception upon the ignorant.

During the dark ages, all unusual phenomena in the heavens, such as eclipses, comets, and fall-

ing stars, were accounted for by superstition. Those days have passed, and superstition feeds on something less lofty. Catholics are taught to revere a bone, or a tooth, from the body of a martyr, as possessing some divine power of healing or of grace. The picture or statue of a "saint" is claimed to be endowed with the power of working wonders or even miracles! Old sandals, holy hair, even ancient rags are amulets or charms supposed to be possessed of divine virtue! Incredible as it may seem, there are to-day millions among the illiterate Catholics, who reverently believe in these superstitions!

It is time the clergy of the Church set about eradicating this condition of ignorance. All belief in the supernatural should have been banished ages ago, outgrown by the calm, steady development of progressive knowledge.

But above all things, it is time that Catholic teachers infused into their people an appreciation of their individuality, their personality. It is nothing less than a crime to rob them of this by teaching them to place their dependence upon the priest or the Church, the saints or the Virgin. Such beliefs narrow their personality and make them mere machines. They are practically forbidden from obeying the Master's injunction, "Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you!" Was this command uttered only to the priests? Not so. Jesus chose his dis-

ciples from among the unlettered, and his ministry was principally among the poor and the ignorant.

Catholics are, it is believed, invariably trinitarians. The (so-called) Apostles' Creed, as given below, embodies their main faith.

“I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead; He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting, Amen.”

Older than this is the Nicene Creed. It is of unknown authorship, but was adopted by the first Council of Nice, in the year 325, and amended to about its present form by the Council of Constantinople in 381.

In the Catholic “Key of Heaven” (or prayer book) as now in common use, it is rendered as follows:

“I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

“ And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Father, before all ages. God of God. Light of light ; true God of true God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary ; and was made man. (*Here the people kneel down.*) He was crucified also for us, suffered under Pontius Pilate and was buried. The third day He rose again according to the Scriptures and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father ; and He shall come to judge both the living and the dead ; of His kingdom there shall be no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and life-giver who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified ; who spake by the prophets ; and one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come, Amen.”

Formerly this was taught and believed :

“ Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith.

“ Which faith, except every one do keep entire and inviolate, without doubt, he shall everlastingly perish.”\*

\* For this creed in full see page 82 in Chapter on Episcopalianism.



It is not probable that all intelligent Catholics of the present day will insist upon the foregoing. Nothing could be more narrow than to believe that those inhabitants of this globe who lived before the Catholic Church was formed, and the countless millions since who have never heard of it, are everlastingly damned for their innocent lack of information.

The Catholic Church embraces fully two-thirds of all who call themselves Christians. Notwithstanding her great opportunities for extending intelligence and learning, it cannot be denied that she does practically but little in this direction. Her great schools, colleges, and convents are more for inculcating her own religious doctrines than for the promoting and spreading of enlightenment and intelligence.

The people of the republics of South and Central America and Mexico are undoubtedly the most ignorant of all nations known as Christians; schools, teachers, and books are few and far between. In all these countries the Catholic religion prevails. The poor natives, who compose most of their population, have rarely any means of obtaining even the smallest rudiments of an education.

Some years ago the writer, while traveling in Mexico, was obliged to remain for two or three days at a small village called Zanapa, while waiting for horses with which to continue his journey.

Going into the little church near the center of the village, he saw a rude wooden image of the patron saint of the church. He was told with the utmost gravity by the attendant in the church, that on the evening before, they had a procession (a very common custom in such towns), and that they took out the figure of their saint. This was to make it rain. Asked if he would make it rain, the man replied, "Yes, unless the people were very wicked. Then he would not do it." This man and the simple people of the village believed without question, that this clumsily made wooden image possessed the power to produce rain to order! This little single incident is only given as an example of what any traveler in Spanish-American countries may meet in any of the small towns.

Benighted though these people are, they are scarcely more so than the poor peasants of Italy, Spain, or Portugal, countries where intelligence instead of dense ignorance ought to be the rule. Here the poor people are mostly huddled into small villages, every one of which has its church, with its outfit of priests and attendants. These of course live from the labor of the peasants, and in return, keep them in densest ignorance and make them believe that their only hope of salvation is through church and priest! Pitiably indeed is their condition, and there is little or no prospect of improvement.

For this the Catholic Church, through its concurrence and its teaching, should be held chiefly responsible. Contrast the condition of these people with that of the people of England, Germany, or the United States!

If five-sixths of the churches of these countries could be transformed into schoolhouses, nine-tenths of the priestcraft be turned into progressive and capable teachers, and the value of the jewels, the gold, and the silver that so uselessly decorate the images in their cathedrals could be invested in schoolbooks and libraries, in a few generations Italy, Spain, and Portugal would rival the most advanced nations of Europe. Darkness would give way to light, midnight to noonday, ignorance and poverty to intelligence and thrift! Bandits and bull fights would be as rare as they are in Germany or England.\*

Of course there is much of good in the Church to these people. The confessional has a great restraining influence, and amidst the environment of ignorance which prevails it is possibly a necessity at present. It is not so with the people of

\* "What are these?" said Napoleon, pointing to a dozen silver images in a Spanish cathedral.

"Statues of the Twelve Apostles, Sire."

"Melt them, and turn them into coin!"

"But they were given to the Holy Church by Count Blanki-blanki, Sire!"

"Turn them into coin, and let them go about doing good as did their Master! Of what use are they here?"

education, for to them the confessional would be only degrading.

The Catholic Church is noted for its kindness to the poor, the sick, and the suffering. Many of the priests are tireless in their labor for these, and nothing could be more self-sacrificing than the work of the nuns and sisters of charity. Thousands of orphans and invalids are supported and cared for in their asylums and hospitals.

Every one knows that the claim of the Church, that the Protestant movement could not succeed because it was unsupported by the power of Rome, has been abundantly disproved.

Not only did the Reformation succeed, but since then the nations that came under its influence have made far greater progress in science, art, intelligence, and morality, than the nations which adhered to the Church of Rome.

If we think of the influence of the Catholic religion upon its people in the United States, we find that it affects individuals as it does nations. Go to the prisons, the reformatories, the poor-houses, the police and other criminal courts, and you will find the percentage of crime among Catholics (at least claiming to be such) is in far greater proportion than the average.

It would seem from these conditions, plain and clear, that the restraining influence of the Catholic Church is far less than what it should be. If this is not so, it would be instructive and

interesting to hear the proof of a different conclusion.

I have many friends and acquaintances who are members of the Catholic Church. One of my neighbors is a priest. He is a man of earnestness and sincerity, and justly commands the respect of all who know him. I am proud to feel that for many years a friendship has existed between us, though he looks at me as a dreadful heretic, and I look at him as a product of heredity and environment,—“born and raised a Catholic.” If he had been born and raised in Turkey, he would have been an excellent Mohammedan, the good would have come to the surface wherever he came up.

To my Catholic friends I wish to say I have no prejudice whatever against the Church, no wish or willingness to do them a grain of injustice. The opinions I have expressed in a plain way are given from an earnest conviction that the ultra-conservatism of the Church is an injustice both to herself and her people. Changes will come, and she can no more prevent them, than she could prevent the overthrow of the theory that hell was beneath the earth, and heaven above the skies.

#### THE GREEK CHURCH.

This body of Christians, which is correctly known as the “Holy Oriental Orthodox Apostolic Church,” includes the Christians of Russia

and the East. It separated itself from the Catholic Church in the year 1054. Prior to this, the Eastern Christians had many disputes with the Roman Church. One subject of contention (and perhaps the main one) was their refusal to accept the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father *and the Son*. This doctrine was invented and inserted into the Nicene Creed, at the Council of Toledo in the year 589, which added the words, "and the Son." The Eastern churches refused to accept the addition.

They differ in some other points from the Roman Church, perhaps mainly that they have no vicar of Christ on earth, corresponding to the Pope of the Church of Rome.

They are also divided into numerous sects, which, like Protestant Christians of orthodox faith, differ on some points of belief.

#### LUTHERANISM.

Some four hundred years ago, there occurred three great and grand movements in the progress of the world. These were :

- 1st. The discovery of the art of printing.
- 2d. The discovery of the American Continent.
- 3d. The Reformation.

For the last of these the world is indebted to that fearless advocate of truth and right, Martin Luther.

This incomparable man, who was the leader of the Reformation, was the founder of the Lutheran Church, which is the established religion of Germany, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark.

In these different countries the beliefs of Lutherans vary from the severest Calvinism, to the constantly growing liberality which is found in Germany.

It would be entirely out of place, in speaking of Protestantism, to omit giving at least a brief notice of the great Reformer, Martin Luther, who, in the grandeur of his character, had the courage of his convictions to stand up against the abuses of the vast power of the Romish Church.

Luther was born in the year 1483, at Eisleben, in Saxony. His excellent parents gave him a good education, and he pursued his studies in his native town and subsequently at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and Erfurt. At the age of fifteen he composed verse in Latin, and at twenty he took the degree of Master of Arts.

Soon after this, while walking one day with a friend, they were overtaken by a thunder-storm, and his friend was struck by lightning at his side and instantly killed. This made such an impression upon Luther, that he determined upon entering a monastery, and notwithstanding the adverse wishes and advice of his friends, he became an inmate of the Augustinian Monastery at Erfurt in 1505.

At the age of twenty-four he took orders and celebrated his first mass. He had found in the dusty library of the monastery a copy of the Bible in Latin. He diligently studied this neglected book, and in a short time was able with ease to refer to any of its important passages. Prior to this he had, like others, been satisfied with the then current teachings, and had never thought of examining doctrines in which he suspected no error, but now he became dissatisfied and melancholy and settled down to the conclusion that he could no longer be in accord with his early beliefs. And yet for a time he was in doubt and uncertainty as to what should take their place. While in this state he would dispute and argue with those with whom he came in contact, but still his doubts continued. *He had begun to think*, and to prefer study and reflection to the unprogressive, monotonous routine of the Romish ceremonies. He became a great reader and a vigorous writer, but was still a zealous Catholic.

In 1508 he was appointed a professor in the university of Wittenberg. In addition to his duties as teacher he occasionally heard confessions.

While so engaged, he received the confessions of some persons who had been guilty of serious crimes, but who had received remission for them in the form of indulgences. This was denounced by Luther in the most unmistakable language.



The persons in question, considering themselves aggrieved, complained to Tetzel, a German monk, from whom they had obtained these indulgences by purchase. Tetzel was at that time one of the holy commission charged with the extirpation of heresy in Germany, and in his anger he threatened Luther with the tortures of the Inquisition.

Luther remained firm in his position. He still desired to avoid any rupture or breach with the Church, but he was anxious for a discussion which would clearly set forth the claims under contention. It must of course be borne in mind that this was before the days of newspapers. Luther determined to state his position with as much publicity as possible in his immediate neighborhood. He therefore wrote out a series of propositions and affixed them to the church adjoining the castle of Wittenberg, with an invitation for a public discussion of the subjects under consideration.

This was followed by a long and tedious contest between Luther and Tetzel in writing. The former became more and more earnest in his denunciations against the practises he complained of, and it steadily and surely became apparent that the hearts and sympathies of the people were with him ; yet a couple of years passed before he came to an open rupture with the Church.

In 1521 Luther published an essay in which he dissented from several doctrines of the Church.

This essay and some of his other publications were burned with much form and ceremony at the universities of Cologne and Louvain, and also in Rome itself.

In retaliation, Luther publicly burned a number of the Church books, among which were the letters commonly called "Decretals of the Pontiffs" and the "Bull," or proclamation of Pope Leo X. A great multitude of people witnessed this burning of papal documents and clearly evinced their approval of the proceeding. This encouraged and sustained Luther, while the adherents of the Church party were correspondingly disappointed, especially at the inefficiency of the Pope's bull against Luther.

Chagrined and mortified by the futility of his former efforts, the Pope issued another proclamation against Luther, this time denouncing him as a heretic and formally excommunicating him from the holy Church. As in the former instance, however, this bull made little or no impression either upon Luther or his adherents. On the contrary, its effect was only to demonstrate the waning influence of papal decrees, where they came in contact with progressive and independent thought.

The diet, or council, at Worms took place in 1521. It was intended to be so entirely in the interest of the agents of the Pope, that Luther was warned and advised by his friends not to attend on account of personal danger. But he was

fully determined and exclaimed: "If there were as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on the roofs of the houses, I would go on."

He entered the diet on the 17th of April. Here he was asked if he was the author of certain heretical books that were pointed out, and he promptly replied that he was. He was next asked whether he was disposed to retract, or to persist in their contents? To this Luther replied that he would deliver his answer next day.

The most intense excitement prevailed in the city, even the roofs of the houses in the neighborhood of the council are said to have been covered with the thoroughly aroused spectators, who were divided between the adherents and opponents of the great heretic. It is hard to conceive of anything so thrilling and exciting.

The next day Luther again entered the council, and John Eckius (or as more commonly called Doctor Eck), the orator and counsel for the archbishop of Treves, again asked him whether he retracted or persisted in his expressions? Luther answered in a speech which lasted for about two hours. He spoke in tones of clearness and confidence, and this notwithstanding the great numbers crowded into the room, the angry looks and scowls, and the interruptions of his adversaries.

His concluding words were, "Let me then be refuted and convinced by the Scriptures or by the clearest arguments; otherwise I cannot and will

not recant ; for it is neither safe nor expedient to act against conscience. Here I take my stand ; I can do no otherwise, so help me God ! Amen.”

Dr. Eck declared Luther had only answered evasively and that he had no right to express doubts concerning things that had been settled in the councils. To this, Luther again replied claiming his perfect and entire right to think and to decide for himself, and also to express his thoughts when clearly defined.

Many of the people, and among them persons of intelligence and influence, favored Luther, while others took sides against him ; among these was the Emperor. As a result he was declared a heretic and a schismatic. In consequence of this and fearing that the Emperor would not keep his pledge of safe-conduct, the Grand Duke of Saxony caused Luther to be kidnapped on his return from Worms and to be taken to the castle of the Wartburg, where he was kept a prisoner for his own safety for some time. This by no means suppressed his ardent nature. He wrote essays which he found means to publish. Later he carried on controversies, among others one with Henry VIII., King of England,\* whose vanity led him to believe (unfortunately for himself) that he could successfully contend with the Reformer. He, however, only succeeded in making himself ridiculous.

\* This Henry was the man of many wives, and was the founder of the Church of England.

Luther now set himself about the great work of translating the Bible into German. This involved years of labor and close application, but it was finally completed in 1530, and remains to this day substantially as Luther rendered it.

As time went on, books and letters seemed to flow from his pen. He took severely to task some of the German princes, whom he described as "miserable infatuated men, set over the people by God in his anger."

Developing and advancing in his convictions, Luther discontinued wearing his monastic robe and appeared in the plain dress of a teacher. In 1526 he married Catharine Von Bore, who had formerly been a nun. Her sympathies were entirely with her husband, to whom she was a constant support during the remainder of his life.

As a matter of course this marriage was denounced by the adherents of the Church, who maintained that Luther was mad or possessed with an evil spirit. Their denunciations, however, fell harmlessly on unappreciative ears, and the respect and love of the people for Luther continued to increase.

From this time until his death Luther continued to write and speak in the interest of the Reformation. Though this great movement was really begun by Erasmus, Luther was its great and leading spirit. It is said by his biographer, Seckendorff, that the total number of his publications of

a controversial nature was upward of eleven hundred.

He was a poet and a musical composer of great merit. Among his poetical works, is the translation of the Psalms for the use of the people. He died in 1546 at the age of 63.

The foregoing sketch is made as brief as possible. A full account of his life and his great work is most interesting and useful. The world recognizes him as one of the greatest of her children.

#### EPISCOPALIANISM.

Until the reign of Henry VIII., the Romish Church was in the ascendancy in England. That monarch had received from the Pope the title of "Defender of the Faith," for writing a book against the Reformation which Luther had set in motion.

Henry was the man of many wives. Being unable to obtain the sanction of the Pope to his divorce from Queen Catharine, he had one act passed through Parliament, setting aside the authority of the Pope, and another declaring himself to be the supreme head of the Church of England. Of this king's six wives, two were divorced, two were executed, one died, and one survived him. He was excommunicated by the Pope. Hume says of Henry: "A catalogue of his vices would comprehend many of the worst quali-

ties incident to human nature, violence, cruelty, rapacity, injustice, obstinacy, bigotry, caprice; but neither was he subject to all these vices in the most extreme degree, nor was he, at intervals, altogether destitute of virtue. He was capable of at least a temporary friendship." But whatever else he was, this man more than any other was the founder of the English Church.

The belief of Episcopalians is embodied in the two creeds of the Catholic Church, the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds, and in what is known as the "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion." In England the Creed of St. Athanasius is also employed.

The Apostles' Creed is principally used and varies slightly from the version of the Catholics. It is as follows :

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died and was buried. He descended into hell; the third day He rose again from the dead. He ascended into Heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting, Amen."

The Nicene Creed is substantially the same as that of the Catholic Church, as given in the Chapter on that faith.

The Creed of Saint Athanasius is used both by the Catholic Church and the English Church. It is difficult, or at least not quite easy, for intelligence to comprehend by what course of logic the author of it is, or was, given the title of "Saint."

Here it is :

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled; without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the Glory equal, and the Majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son; and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternal; but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet they are



not three Almighty's, but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity ; to acknowledge every Person by himself, to be God and Lord ; So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion, to say, there be three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is made of none ; neither created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone ; not made, nor created but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son ; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers ; one Son, not three Sons ; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other ; none is greater, or less than another. But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal.

“So that in all things, as is aforesaid ; the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess ; that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds ; and Man of the substance of his Mother, born in the world. Perfect God, and perfect Man ; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead ; and inferior to the Father as touching

his Manhood. Who, although he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh; but by taking of the Manhood into God. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance; but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ. Who suffered for our salvation; descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the Catholic faith; which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen."

Athanasius might with equal propriety have added this :

"When one person of the Godhead takes snuff, they all sneeze; and yet there are not three sneezes, but one sneeze."

He would simply have added to his creed another statement—not one whit more absurd than his other inventions!

The chief function of this creed seems to be an attempt to explain the dogma of the Trinity, but it can only be said that the explanation is, if

possible, more obscure than the dogma it professes to elucidate. No one need hesitate to pronounce it a pure invention, a hopeless jumble, as unreliable as it is absurd. There exists not the slightest evidence that Athanasius *knew* more of the Godhead than other men; simply nothing.

Whatever may have been the object of St. Athanasius and the other Fathers in inventing the Trinity idea, is a matter of conjecture only. It may have come from a desire to display their superior wisdom to the common people, who so blindly depended upon the priests for guidance. Be that as it may, its distinct effect has been to mystify religion, to complicate theology, to befog those who are inquiring, and to obscure truth.

This creed has been omitted from the Book of Common Prayer as used in the United States; rejected as unreasonable and unbelievable.

The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion of the Episcopal Church are as follows:

## ARTICLES

AGREED UPON BY THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF BOTH PROVINCES, AND THE WHOLE CLERGY,

In the Convocation holden at London, in the year 1562, for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion; reprinted by His Majesty's Com-

mandment, with His Royal Declaration prefixed thereunto.

#### “ HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION.

“ Being by God's Ordinance, according to our just Title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor of the Church within these our Dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our Kingly Office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge, in Unity of true Religion, and in the bond of Peace; and not to suffer unnecessary Disputations, Altercations, or questions to be raised, which may nourish Faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have therefore, upon mature Deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this Declaration following:

“ That the Articles of the Church of England (which have been allowed and authorized heretofore, and which our clergy generally have subscribed unto), do contain the true doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles; which to that end, we command to be new printed, and this our Declaration to be published therewith.

“ That we are supreme Governour of the Church of England; and that if any difference arise about the external Policy concerning the Injunctions, Canons, and other constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the Clergy, in their Convocation, is to order and settle them, having first

obtained leave under our Broad Seal so to do; and we approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions; providing that none be made contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Land.

“That out of our princely Care, that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the Bishops and the Clergy, from time to time in Convocation, upon their humble desire, shall have License under our Broad Seal to deliberate of, and to do all such things as, being made plain by them, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled Continuance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England now established; from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least Degree.

“That for the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all Clergymen within our realm, have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established; which is an argument to us, that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points, in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them; which is an argument again, that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established.

“That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God’s promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures, and in the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall

either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

“That if any publick reader in either of our Universities, or any Head or Master of a College, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any Article, or shall publickly read, determine or hold any publick Disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities or Colleges respectively; or if any divine in the Universities shall preach or print anything either way, other than is already established in Convocation with our Royal assent; he, or they the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church’s censure in our Commission Ecclesiastical, as well as any other; and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.”

## “ARTICLES OF RELIGION.”

### I. OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY.

“There is but one living and true God, everlasting without body, parts or passions; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the Maker and preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in Unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

### II. OF THE WORD OR SON OF GOD, WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father,

begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

### III. OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL.

As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.

### IV. OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature, wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

### V. OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father, and the Son, very and eternal God.

### VI. OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.

Holy Scriptures containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read

therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis,  
Exodus,  
Leviticus,  
Numbers,  
Deuteronomy,  
Joshua,  
Judges,  
Ruth,  
The First Book of Samuel,  
The Second Book of Samuel,  
The First Book of Kings,  
The Second Book of Kings,  
The First Book of Chronicles,  
The Second Book of Chronicles,  
The First Book of Esdras,  
The Second Book of Esdras,  
The Book of Esther,  
The Book of Job,  
The Psalms,  
The Proverbs,  
Ecclesiastes or Preacher,  
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,  
Four Prophets the greater,  
Twelve Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as Hieromes saith) the



Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners ; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine ; such are these following :

The Third Book of Esdras,  
 The Fourth Book of Esdras,  
 The Book of Tobias,  
 The Book of Judith,  
 The rest of the Book of Esther,  
 The Book of Wisdom,  
 Jesus the Son of Sirach,  
 Baruch the Prophet,  
 The Song of the Three Children,  
 The Story of Susanna,  
 Of Bel and the Dragon,  
 The Prayer of Manasses,  
 The First Book of Maccabees,  
 The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

#### VII. OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New ; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, does not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth ; yet notwithstanding no Christian man whatsoever is free from the

obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

### VIII. OF THE THREE CREEDS.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

### IX. OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH-SIN.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

### X. OF FREE WILL.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by

his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

#### XI. OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings; wherefore that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

#### XII. OF GOOD WORKS.

Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

#### XIII. OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to God, for as much as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not

done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

#### XIV. OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

Voluntary Works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly when ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

#### XV. OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be the lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.

#### XVI. OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore, the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after

Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

## XVII. OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation as vessels made to honor. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ: they walk religiously, in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward

God: So, for curious and carnal persons lacking the spirit of Christ to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: And, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

#### XVIII. OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

#### XIX. OF THE CHURCH.

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremony, but also in matters of faith.

## XX. OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith : and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

## XXI. OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes. And when they be gathered together (for as much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore, things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

## XXII. OF PURGATORY.

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images, as of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

## XXIII. OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully, called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

## XXIV. OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people.

## XXV. OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Sacraments ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will toward us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him. There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called sacraments, that is to say



Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly our states of life allowed in the scriptures; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God. The sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

XXVI. OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE  
MINISTERS WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EF-  
FECT OF THE SACRAMENT.

Although in the visible church, the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet, for as much as they do not the same in their own name but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry both in hearing the Word of God and in receiving of the sacrament. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacrament ministered unto them; which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men. Nevertheless it appertaineth to the disci-

pline of the Church that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offenses; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.

#### XXVII. OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

#### XXVIII. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; inso-much that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by holy writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath

given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped.

XXIX. OF THE WICKED WHICH EAT NOT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

XXX. OF BOTH KINDS.

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people; for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

XXXI. OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone, wherefore, the sacrifices of

masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

### XXXII. OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Bishops, priests, and deacons are not commanded by God's laws either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore, it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to Godliness.

### XXXIII. OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated or to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an heathen and publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.

### XXXIV. OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of

God and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church and hurteth the authority of the magistrate and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

XXXV. OF THE HOMILIES.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a Godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right Use of the Church.
2. Against Peril of Idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean the Churches.
4. Of good Works: first of Fasting.
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6. Against Excess of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9. That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.
11. Of Alms-doing.

12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the Passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament  
of the Body and Blood of Christ.
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.
17. For the Rogation-days.
18. Of the State of Matrimony.
19. Of Repentance.
20. Against Idleness.
21. Against Rebellion.

### XXXVI. OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering; neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated, or ordered, according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King Edward unto this time, or hereafter, shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

### XXXVII. OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and her other Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or

Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction. Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which Titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended ; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify ; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself ; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers. The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England. The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offenses. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

#### XXXVIII. OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS, WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

#### XXXIX. OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

As we confess that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus

Christ, and James his Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment and truth."

It will be noticed that Article XVII. especially sets forth the doctrine of predestination, whereby "before the foundations of the world were laid," God selected and chose those who should be saved.

Episcopalians generally disclaim this doctrine, in fact but a small percentage of them have read it, or even know of its existence in the "Articles."

Originally there were forty-two of these Articles and they were adopted in England in 1553. Ten years later they were reduced to their present number and form, and *every clergyman in the English Church is required to subscribe to them his declaration of consent!*

As with the details of the creeds, Episcopalians take great latitude as to the extent to which they believe the Articles.

In like manner they have a prayer (The Absolution or Remission of sins).

"Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness, and live; and *hath given power*, and commandment, to his ministers, to declare and pronounce



“to his people, being penitent, the *Absolution and Remission of their sins*. He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel. Wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true repentance, and his holy Spirit, that those things may please him, which we do at this present; and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure, and holy; so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

It thus says that God has *empowered* his ministers to declare when sins are forgiven.

This is much like the Catholic form, from which it is patterned. Of course there is no evidence whatever of the giving of such power or authority, except in the teachings of the “fathers.”

To an unprejudiced mind, it seems strange and inconsistent, that so many unbelieved, or half-believed, tenets are retained.

They are mockeries of sincerity. The *New York Sun* of Feb. 9, 1900, has the following item on its Editorial page. It bears so directly on what I have just been writing that I copy it in full:

*New York Sun*, Feb. 9, 1900.

#### AN AWFUL SIN.

“Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART, in refusing to sign the profession of faith submitted to him by Cardinal VAUGHAN, with mental reservations which would practically nullify it, has set an ex-

ample of honesty which might well bring the blush of shame to many theologians who are now outwardly professing a faith which inwardly they deny.

“Speaking of the clause in the confession requiring him to assent to the dogma that the Scriptures not merely ‘contain revelation with which there is no mixture of error,’ but also, ‘having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have GOD as their author and have been delivered to the Church as such,’ he tells the Cardinal :

“ ‘It would be easy, of course, by a little dexterity, to distort and evade what appears to be ‘its real and obvious meaning. As GOD is the ‘First Cause and Creator of all things, He is, in ‘that sense, their Author; Author of the Decameron of BOCCACCIO, as well as of the Bible. ‘But to make a profession with such a meaning ‘would be, in my eyes, grossly profane and altogether unjustifiable.’

“Many recent Biblical critics, however, have had no such scruples of conscience. They have continued to profess adherence to standards of faith, the Westminster Confession, for example, ‘by a little dexterity’ or trickery of the sort which Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART, an honest man, draws back from in horror as ‘grossly profane and altogether unjustifiable.’ Of course, as he says, GOD as the Author of all things may be called the Author of everything written, but, as all men know, that is not the sense in which these standards describe the authorship of the Bible as the Word of GOD, and to accept them with any such reservation or any reservation in the mind is flagrantly dishonest and deceitful.

“Most of all is honesty, is sincerity, is absolute straightforwardness requisite in dealing with the living GOD whom a man professes to fear and worship. If he is an infidel, if he doubts, if he cannot reconcile and submit his reason to a confession of faith exacted of him, or in any way rejects it in its plain and literal sense, he is a blasphemous liar when he pretends to accept it as a condition of remaining in a ministry solemnly pledged to sustain and teach it. Moreover, he is a coward, a humbug, a time server, a seller of his soul for a mess of pottage, false both to religion and to reason. With that awful sin Prof. ST. GEORGE MIVART is not willing to load his conscience.”

Periodically, the bishops of the Episcopal Church hold a council at a place in England called Lambeth—a suburb of London. The subjects which are under consideration are of such extraordinary and momentous importance, that the sessions are held behind closed doors; the laity may hardly be trusted with such weighty matters. Possibly they may some day mitigate the inconsistencies of the prayer book, which have little, if anything, more than relic value. While such an act would be likely to meet with the approval of the greater proportion of their Church members, there are those who would be horrified by what they would consider such a dreadful desecration. Among them are many divines (!) who are pestered with the nineteenth century, and prefer the

dark ages or—quite the same thing—the teachings of those who lived in those serene centuries.

Fashion and wealth in this country gravitate toward the Episcopal Church more than toward any other.

#### PRESBYTERIANISM.

Many Episcopalians are fond of referring to Presbyterians as being very narrow in their religious views. Judged by their books, there is very little difference between them. It is much like the little boy who reported to his father that his brother had his eyes open during prayers.

There is, however, this dissimilarity. The Episcopalian serenely reads his creed and his liturgy, and believes as much or as little of it as he pleases. For example, few of them believe in the resurrection of the body; many doubt the immaculate conception; and yet they repeat these things every time they attend church, excusing themselves in various ways for apparent insincerity.

The Presbyterian, on the other hand, usually stands up for his creed and his confession of faith, and he will tell you, in fact seems to have made himself believe, that there is entire harmony between the doctrine of fore-ordination and free-will; that God knows exactly what a man is going to do in every detail of his earthly existence, and yet the man is free to do as he wills!

Illogical and impossible though such doctrine

may be, the Presbyterian who defends it is less inconsistent than his Episcopal brother who *excuses* rather than defends his dogmas, who dodges and evades the question.

The main beliefs of all orthodox Protestant Churches are substantially alike. A few years ago all were equally rigid, while to-day all have modified the severity of their teachings.

The constitution of the Presbyterian Church is embodied in their Confession of Faith. This was adopted in this country in 1729, but has several times been slightly amended. It sets forth a belief in the Holy Scriptures. Of these it says:

“The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.

“There is but one living and true God, who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts, or passions, immutable, immense, eternal, incomprehensible, almighty, most wise, most holy, most free, most absolute, working all things according to the counsel of his own immutable and most righteous will, for his own glory; most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin; the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and withal most just and terrible in his judgments, hating all sin, and who will by no means clear the guilty.

“ In the Unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power and eternity ; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding ; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father ; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

“ Although God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions, yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions. (*Rather obscure.*)

“ By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death.

“ These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed ; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

“ God hath appointed the elect unto glory.

“ The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin to the praise of his glorious justice.”

It seems incomprehensible that intelligent and educated men can, in these days, teach or believe in such doctrine, can ascribe to a loving God such elements of injustice and savage cruelty.

“ It pleased God . . . to create or make of

nothing, the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and *all very good.*

“God in his ordinary providence maketh use of means, yet is free to work without, above, and against them, at his pleasure.

“Elect infants, dying in infancy, are saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth.”

These are only a few extracts from the “Confession of Faith.” There are chapters on—

“God’s Covenant with Man,” “Free Will,” “Effectual Calling,” “Justification,” “Adoption,” “Sanctification,” and “Saving Faith.” These doctrines and dogmas are so shrouded and obscured in mystery and ambiguity, so inconsistent with the teachings of Jesus that God is Love, so entirely out of harmony with the intelligence and reason with which the Creator has endowed us, that they are only as “sounding brass or tinkling cymbals.”

Perfect harmony does not prevail in the Presbyterian denomination. They have the liberals who are demanding the “why” in relation to the unprovable inventions that are embodied in the doctrines of the Church. They have the conservatives who not only fail to answer the “whys,” but deny the right of their brethren to question the propriety of what has been the doctrine of the Church, mostly as handed down by Calvin.

John Calvin lived during the times of the Reformation and was to a certain extent a co-worker with Luther against the assumptions of the Church of Rome. Though very ready to condemn the Catholics for their teachings and beliefs, he was himself narrow and bigoted. A man of great ability and learning, he was an extreme fanatic. Here is an incident illustrative of his character. Michael Servetus, an eminent physician, was also a reformer, but held anti-trinitarian views. At one time he and Calvin were friends. Later they corresponded on doctrinal points, Calvin endeavoring to correct the errors of his friend and to "set him right," but failing therein. Servetus, in 1553, visited Calvin at Geneva. The latter caused his arrest and trial for heresy. *He was condemned and burned at the stake!*

In this course, Calvin undoubtedly believed he was serving God! To such a savage crime may a man be brought by fanaticism and bigotry!

A Presbyterian lady said to me that "the death of Servetus was a great trial to Calvin!"—A great trial indeed! In the name of humanity, of what consequence was it to the tortured Servetus, or to the world, whether Calvin danced around the blazing fire or drove in the background? Had he possessed the *true* spirit of religion, he would—at the last moment—have scattered the fagots he himself had kindled. But, blinded by bigotry, Calvin was insensible to the religion of



Jesus, kindness toward his fellow men! Creed and doctrine and dogma were his idols, images which obscured from his vision or understanding the only true God! Calvin was a creature of his times and surroundings. In these days he would not be tolerated in any enlightened land. How is it, then, that people who would condemn him now can revere him and his theories because he lived in the dark ages? Does it not look like admiring savage cruelty at a distance? "A great trial" indeed!

Poor Calvin. He is entitled to pity on account of the darkness in which he lived. I can appreciate something of this. But when I endeavor to comprehend how in these enlightened days, people can be found who will mix his teaching with the doctrines of the "fathers" and then swallow the whole dose,—when I try to understand this I must confess myself a dismal failure. It is too much for me.

In the Presbyterian Catechism, the Godhead is thus described: "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; These three are one God; the same in substance; equal in power and glory."

This agrees with the Creeds. Jesus however said—The Father is greater than I! (John xiv. 28). It necessarily follows, that if the Creeds are correct, Jesus must have been under a wrong impression.

The conservatives among Presbyterians are in control, and they are driving from their membership some of their most intelligent thinkers and brightest minds. With them the verdict is, that to think, or to suspect a possibility of error in the doctrines, is a crime.

The membership of this Church is not increasing in this country at present. Why is this? And this question is a serious one for the Presbyterian Church. I will confine myself to asking a few questions; the reader may supply the answers. Is not the Church really suffering from excessive theology? In the Westminster Confession of Faith, has she not more of a load than she is able to carry? Does not the intelligence of the Church KNOW that it is full of absurdities? Is it not true that her ministers are required to teach doctrines, with which the ablest of them are not in earnest sympathy? Is it not true that those of their members who are supposed to accept and believe the whole long list of dogmas and doctrines are people who give their meaning very little serious or earnest thought? Are they not driving from their pulpits some of their brightest minds, and throttling others with the grip of orthodoxy?

#### METHODISM.

This sect is very numerous in the United States. Originating in England, it was founded

principally by John Wesley about the year 1740. It has, however, flourished more in America than in the mother country.

The beliefs of Methodists may be found in their church book, known as "The Discipline." They are trinitarians; believe in the fall of man from original holiness and in the atonement, and they use the Apostles' Creed, except that they omit the sentence, "He descended into Hell."

Their church government is episcopal in form, having annual conferences which are presided over by a bishop, who is elected by the General Conference which is held every four years. The Bishop and Elders of districts of the conference appoint and decide where the ministers shall be located.

Methodists are often very emotional, but are full of earnestness and diligent in church work.

They are eminent as pioneers in our newly settled regions, and wherever they are found, their aims and influence are uplifting and useful.

#### THE BAPTIST FAITH.

The "Declaration of Faith" in the Baptist Manual sets forth:

I. "The Old and New Testament Scriptures were written by men divinely inspired, and are the only sufficient and perfect rule of faith and practise.

2. "There is one God, and only one, who is self-existent, eternal, and infinite in every excellence, and who has revealed himself as Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, the same in essence, though distinct in personality.

3. "Man was created innocent. By disobedience of the command of God he fell, thereby losing his innocence, becoming subject to death, and to the eternal displeasure of God.

4. "Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, came into the world to save men from the guilt and condemnation of sin, offering his blood as an atonement, and making it available to all who exercise faith in him."

Of Baptism the Manual says: "Baptism, as a symbolic act, must in its form be definite and unvarying. The only baptism that can represent a burial and resurrection is immersion, whereby the whole body is laid beneath the water and raised therefrom."

In a spirit of liberality the Manual says: "Differences of opinion on many doctrines and differences of interpretation of many passages of Scripture are natural and admissible."

Baptists have existed for many centuries, perhaps since the earliest dates of the Christian era, though not under their present name. They are numerous in Europe where, in olden times, they were sometimes persecuted and outlawed. In the United States they number nearly four millions.

## CONGREGATIONALISM.

Congregationalists are so named from their system of church government, which is vested in each individual church. They are subject to no bishop, synod, assembly, or conference. Naturally this gives them great independence, not only as to church management, but also in matters of creed and thought.

In some of their churches the Apostles' Creed is used, as the preference of its members may determine.

On the whole, Congregationalists incline toward trinitarian rather than toward unitarian views. Many of their members, however, hold unitarian beliefs, and against this there is no protest. Full liberty is permitted and respected.

## UNITARIANISM.

From Congregationalism to Unitarianism is an easy step. A step upward toward the light, a step in the transit from mystery, doubt, and complexity toward that which is at once scriptural, reasonable, and possible.

The best religious thought of the world is concentrating in a belief in ONE omniscient, all pervading, omnipresent GOD. Whittier realizes this when he writes :—

“ Oh, sometimes gleams upon our sight,  
Through present wrong, the eternal Right;  
And step by step, since time began,  
We see the steady gain of man.

“ That all of good the past hath had  
Remains to make our own time glad,  
Our common, daily life divine,  
And every land a Palestine,

“ Through the harsh noises of our day,  
A low sweet prelude finds its way;  
Through clouds of doubt, and creeds of fear,  
A light is breaking, calm and clear.

“ Henceforth my heart shall sigh no more  
For olden time and holier shore;  
God’s love and blessing then and there,  
Are now, and here, and everywhere.”

There exists nowhere a better or truer example of inspiration than this.

The Unitarian belief may be said to have always existed. In all ages of which we have any account, there have been men who believed in one creating and governing cause, one God.

The Jews are, and always have been, Unitarians. How was it with the earliest Christians? Is there anybody who believes that Jesus was a trinitarian? Did He ever say one word respecting it? Did He at any time define or attempt to define what trinitarians are pleased to call the Godhead? Did either Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John

say that "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God"? Three of these were with Him through most of His ministry. If they were taught that He was God, or if they looked upon Him as God, it is incredible that they should not have mentioned it. Yet from their direct intercourse and association with Him, they must have known how He regarded Himself.

The fact is plain and apparent, and that without deep research or theological aid, that neither Jesus nor His Apostles were any more trinitarians than were the Jews among whom they lived. They were Unitarians, as were all of the early Christians. Jesus repeatedly spoke of God, as "My Father," "Your Father," "Our Father;" always as one, never of that man-made incongruity, the trinitarian Godhead.

If one will but read the letters of Paul, no mention of the trinity, or anything like it, from beginning to end will be found.

Nor, it may be added, does he even allude to His virgin birth nor to the resurrection of His physical body! It is fair to inquire, Did Paul believe in these things? If so, is it not strange that in his teachings and explanations of Christianity, he omitted all mention of them?

J. P. Newman in his "Development of Christian Doctrine" shows that the doctrine of the Trinity was not completely established in the Romish Church before the fourth century.

About this time lived Arius. He protested against the adoption by the Church of the doctrine of the Trinity, but he was opposed by the majority. In the Council of Nice, in 325, he offered a creed that was torn to pieces, himself but narrowly escaping a similar fate. The Nicene Creed was then presented and adopted.

Though in the minority, there were many who refused to endorse the trinitarian doctrine. Arius was a man of great intellectual power and he became their leader, and from this circumstance they were called Arians.

The Unitarians are the Arians of to-day. There is no body of Christians that has a higher reverence for the Saviour than they. Their ministers baptize "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." At confirmation the minister asks:—"Do you believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God?"

Answer: "I do."

"Will you renounce the fellowship of evil, and endeavor to do the will of God as revealed by Jesus Christ?"

Answer: "I will."

It is not uncommon, however, to hear members of Orthodox Churches denounce Unitarians in the severest terms, frequently declaring that they are not Christians. At the same time they will probably maintain that they themselves are "very liberal" and desire to respect the religious beliefs



of other churches. This claim is, to say the least, slightly inconsistent.

The plain fact is, the orthodox churchman believes in Jesus according to the interpretation of the "fathers," as announced in the fourth and fifth centuries; in times when only the priests and "fathers" were permitted to read the Bible.

The Unitarian, on the other hand, insists upon his right to read the Bible and interpret its meaning. He believes in the plain precepts of Jesus, as taught by Himself when He was on the earth.

The Lord's Prayer is distinctly a Unitarian Prayer. In it there is no suggestion of "Holy, blessed, and glorious trinity, three persons and one God!" Unitarian also is that last prayer, when from the cross He cried, "Father, forgive them!" Unitarians fail entirely to understand how any Christian can squarely deny the words of Jesus, when He said, "The Father is greater than I."

#### UNIVERSALISM.

No important body of Christians is so little understood by other sects as the Universalists. The average idea is, that the Universalist believes that at death all go immediately to Heaven or to a condition of complete happiness! The fact is, they believe that every human being enters his next existence, very much in the same condition in which he leaves the present one.

The Universalist Confession of Faith says: "We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind."

The following is a declaration of Universalist Principles, adopted at Boston, Mass., in 1899, with the statement that no precise form of words is required:

1. "The Universal Fatherhood of God.
2. "The spiritual authority and leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ.
3. "The trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation from God.
4. "The certainty of just retribution for sin.
5. "The final harmony of all souls with God."

The Church as an organization does not demand a distinct form of creed for all.

In the "Church of the Eternal Hope," in New York City, the following Creed is used: "We believe in the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the Spiritual Leadership of Jesus Christ, and the Immortality of the Soul.

"We believe that Goodness is the Eternal Law of God, and will finally overcome all evil; and that only as we accept and practise this Law, can we find peace, in this world, or in the world to come."

Universalists reject the doctrine that man is under the wrath and curse of God for the sins of

his ancestors. They also reject such doctrines as the atonement, justification by faith, etc., etc.

Of the theory of salvation the Rev. Dr. Jas. M. Pullman says: "It is held that moral development is not confined to the present state of existence, but is conterminous with the whole duration of man; that salvation consists in the formation of a character conformed to God's will; that such a character cannot be instantaneously acquired, nor produced in any other way than by the voluntary action of the individual; that rewards and punishments are aids to the development of character, and not ends or finalities; that God's love is clearly shown in penalty as well as in reward, since, by the return of his deeds upon his head, man is made aware that there is somebody in the universe who cares for which way he goes; that punishment is medicinal and corrective; that the remission of the penalties of voluntary disobedience would be unmerciful; that forgiveness does not involve such remission, but works a change in the attitude of the soul, which ennobles, instead of degrading the sinner. Universalism affirms that the revelation of the divine character through the Christ is the most potent awakener of the moral energy of man; that the chief function of the Church of Christ is to hold His ideal of life and character before men, and assist them to attain it; that man cannot find salvation by withdrawing from the sphere of life's duties, but that the great

school of moral discipline and spiritual culture is to be found in the common personal relationships and ordinary pursuits of life."

Immortality is endless opportunity and unlimited possibility.

## CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND MENTAL SCIENCE.

THESE organizations represent the most modern forms of religious and ethical belief. To many, perhaps to most people, this assertion will be a surprise. The general sentiment seems to be, that they are inventions to heal physical disease by supernatural force, are claims of healing disease by miraculous power! One divine (!) announced this from his pulpit, and said he had investigated the subject and that it was "neither Christian nor scientific!" What this fossilized divine (!) does not know about Christian or Mental Science would make a large and interesting volume. He comprehended Christian and Mental Science about as much as Saint Anathasius comprehended what is called the "Godhead," which he attempted to explain in that jumble of absurd guesswork known as the "Athanasian Creed."

Nothing could be further from truth, than to assert that they claim miraculous power. On the other hand, Mental Scientists, at least, deny that a miracle, as commonly understood, ever has or ever will occur. They hold that throughout the

universe there is one great all-pervading, constantly developing, forever advancing Force, one Eternal Life "in whom we live and move and have our being," and that this great force is God. It dwells within each of us, and is our highest form of self; above the physical body, above the mentality or intellect, above the moral and the spiritual.

Jesus was perfect in and through the fact that He fully recognized and comprehended this Force, this God within Himself, and in this He was far in advance of any human being of whom we have any account. His whole life was a demonstration of the power of God's Truth, an indwelling power that was over all corruption, all error, all disease, all sin and death. Man may attain to this condition, but only through a sincere and true recognition of his highest self. It is within the power of every human being to advance toward this recognition whenever he elects to do so.

Mind is capable of directing itself. It is influenced by both body and spirit, but can decide for itself which influence shall predominate. Yielding to the former, man becomes perhaps licentious, perhaps a drunkard, a glutton, the power of his higher self becomes weaker, less restraining, and the man becomes vicious. Choosing the latter, he is aided and uplifted. He grows in sincerity, in kindness, right, goodness. As he proceeds, he

will find that its fruits are contentment, satisfaction, and happiness.

There is not the slightest doubt but that this condition is most favorable for the cure of bodily diseases. Experience proves this. All physicians acknowledge it, and have recognized its influence from time immemorial. But few of them realize the full meaning of their words when they say, "Now let nature do the rest," as though great nature was secondary to nostrum! Yet let me not be misunderstood in speaking of that noble body of men, the physicians. Every one knows how prominent they have been in advancing the world of science, both within and without the profession. They are, in an eminent degree, leaders in intellectual progress; however, they themselves, or at least most of them, will admit that many of their number are quite indisposed to adopt the advances that are being made every year by the profession. A majority of them, so far as I can see, are disposed to combat the beliefs in mental healing. Fortunately this majority is decreasing. The able editor of one of our Medical Journals recently published an editorial in which he said that one hundred years from now very little medicine would be prescribed or given, and that the doctors' treatment would then be principally by suggestion! We cannot expect doctors (any more than dominies) to pay much attention to criticisms from the unprofessional, but an article like

the one referred to should make them lay aside their prejudices and think of the possibilities of mentality.

That there is an invisible channel or atmosphere, through which a person is affected by the presence or thought or act of another, admits of no doubt. Perhaps the most common and simple illustration of this is the act of yawning, which is often spoken of as "catching." A man may not only bring himself under the power of his own higher being, but he may be, and is, affected by the influence of those by whom he is surrounded and with whom he comes in contact. It is through this means that the influence of the mental healer is exercised upon the sick or infirm. The real healing force is *within* every human being; it is simply aided in asserting itself by the influence of the healer.

Many have never heard of this sciencce. Many have "seen something of it, but gave it no attention," others have heard enough concerning mental science to sneer and scoff at it. Among these are, of course, persons of intelligence, but there are also the egotistical, the established, the prejudiced, those who are sure they are sound in doctrine, and—the truly ignorant. On the other hand, thousands of intelligent and thoughtful people are giving careful consideration to this growing development, and the result is, that they are usually convinced that mental science is not




only built upon foundations of truth, but that it embodies a *religious belief that is in advance of all others.*

Mental Science deals with disease of the body as well as of the mind, and the higher elements that are within us, the moral and the spiritual; and it does this through the influence of the higher over the lower. If we believe that the mind is superior to the body, and that the soul or spirit is superior to the mind, it is logically plain that the higher element (or elements) should influence the mind in the same manner that the mind influences the body. This last influence is not only acknowledged by all physicians, but comes within the experience and observation of every one. A person is often made ill through anger, or fear, or worry, and if the mind of a sick man is occupied with such emotions, his condition is far less favorable for recovery, than when his mentality is quiet and placid. It is of even greater importance that the higher self should be serene and tranquil. It is just here that the influence of the healer is helpful.

The term "healer" is not entirely correct. It is apt to give the impression of a person who possesses the power of working supernaturally—miraculously. This is far from the fact. Mental Science disclaims miracle. A healer must be full of sincerity and truth, must be imbued with the highest form of reverence for and faith and con-

fidence in GOD! His aim is to lead toward the same condition those whom he would aid. This involves a religion in itself, a religion that leads us higher, a religion that is Christlike!

Mental Scientists are believers in an evolution from lowest to highest, from the lowest visible to the highest invisible. The following diagram illustrates this:



Man has the mental and may by his own choice attain the moral, the spiritual; he may even ascend to the Divine, as did Jesus, the great leader.

All believers in Mental Science make use of what is called self-treatment. The following is an illustration of this, and is from *The Exodus* of June, 1897.

It is for "Insomnia," and whoever suffers from that cause, would do well to commit it to memory and to repeat it mentally when they have closed their eyes for sleep, *earnestly applying it to their true higher self*:

(When there is the sense named "Insomnia.")

I am free from all struggle and strife.

I am free from anxiety and apprehension.

I am free from all strain and tension.

I abide under the shadow of the Almighty!

I am able to see what I should do: I am able to do what I see should be done.

I have clear vision, because I desire to do only that which is right and just.

I shall not entangle myself; I shall be shown the way in which I should walk, moment by moment.

Whatever comes into my mortal experience, for me there is no loss; there can be only gain.

Because of what I am in being, nothing pertaining to my growth in self-recognition can bring me real harm.

I see and feel that I am complete and whole; and that I live and move and have this being in God, my Cause.

I am safe and secure every moment.

I am cradled in the eternal arms, I rest upon the Infinite bosom.

I am sinking into that sleep which is peace and rest, refreshment and strengthening.

It is mine, as a child-soul that is nurtured from the divine; and I have no fear of aught that can befall me.

There is One that neither slumbers nor sleeps, and I am guarded and protected.

I give myself up to quiet slumber. I sleep with the sleeping world; with the fields and the flowers; with the creatures small and great.

For we are one Brotherhood; and I hear the voice of our Father in the murmur of the stream;

in the gentle rustle of the night-wind; in the breath of the flowers.

It says to me, "Rest, my child. All things rest. Take your rest. I am here. I will never leave nor forsake you."

I let go all effort to do or to be.

I sink back into these waiting arms.

I feel them close tenderly about me.

I am in the "green pastures," beside the "still waters." I am with the good Shepherd of the sheep."

I am asleep, for "He giveth His beloved sleep.

This is an example of inspiration; and if it were in the "Psalms," it would be regarded as one of the most beautiful.

The following, taken from the *Literary Digest* of Feb. 10th, 1800, shows that M. Constant is clearly in harmony with Mental Science:

#### WHAT IS TO BE THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE?

"A work which has attracted much attention has lately appeared from the pen of a French *savant*, M. Henri Constant, in which he expresses the view of many thinkers in France as to the future of religion. He regards dogmatic Christianity as hopelessly discredited and undermined, from the historical, scientific, and ethical standpoints. Yet, he believes, the sterile negations, or still more brutal affirmations of materialism, will never satisfy the human intellect or the soul, and the time will come when the noble philosophy of the Neo-

Platonists and the doctrines of the extreme Orient will be sifted and accepted in part, supplemented by numerous contributions from the virile intellect and spirit of the West, including much from physical science, from spiritualism, and from such schools of thought as that of Prentice Mulford and the new metaphysical or mental science movement. In the light of this rational and humane religion, the dark superstitions and grotesque survivals of former barbarian ages will be dissipated as the sun scatters the shades of night. M. Constant formulates his prophetic statement of this new religion in part, as follows:

“First—A supreme intelligence rules the worlds. That intelligence, which we call God, is the conscious Ego of the universe. It is in the universe, for the universe, and through the universe that the divine thought is objectified.

“Second—All creations develop themselves in an ascending series, without a break in the continuity. The mineral realm passes insensibly into the vegetable, the vegetable in the animal, and this, in turn, into the human with no sharply marked lines of distinction. There is a double evolution, material and spiritual. These two forms of evolution run parallel and jointly, life itself being but a manifestation of the spirit appearing as movement.”

#### AGNOSTICISM.

Some one has said that Agnosticism is the science of believing in nothing. This seems to be about the best possible definition.

Agnostics have, so far as we know, neither or-

ganization, creed, nor belief. This is perhaps balanced by their superabundance of unbelief, which they have stored up in an unlimited quantity. They deny all evidence that cannot be physically and absolutely demonstrated.

The late Robert G. Ingersoll was for many years their chief exponent in the United States. He was a man of unusually pure moral character, of large reasoning power, and great persuasive ability. He had many religious controversies with clergymen of various orthodox denominations, which were published in the *North American Review*, in all of which he had clearly the best of the argument. He was immensely popular as a speaker.

Great, though, as were his abilities, his success lay more in the weakness of the doctrines which he assailed, than in the strength of his own position. He was narrow and often unfair, in that he was destitute of charity for those who differed with him. Yet it must be admitted that his influence upon religious thought and teachings was of vast effect in modifying and ameliorating the severities of tenets that have lost much of their force during the past twenty-five years. He seemed incapable of appreciating anything in man higher than intelligence. Had he been less of a materialist his influence might have been more extended.

By many, it is supposed that Thomas Paine (who more than a century ago wrote "The Age

of Reason ") was an Agnostic. Such is not the case. He was a Deist. He wrote a brief creed which embodied his faith as follows :

“ I believe in one God and no more ; and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

“ I believe in the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy.”

Not a bad faith to live by ! \*

\* No seeker after religious truths will make a mistake by reading the works of Thomas Paine. He was a profound reasoner, and no man of his day knew how to adjust and use the scales of mental philosophy better than he.

## CONCLUSION.

IN bringing this little volume to a close, it seems quite in place, that the author should note briefly some of his own beliefs upon the subjects of which he has been writing, even though they may be of little value. He only claims, that whether his thoughts be considered good, bad, or indifferent, they are entirely honest. He has no desire to dwell upon or even point out errors that exist in the Bible. All students of that grand old book know that they are numerous. He has, however, no such feeling toward teachers of the present day, who lend themselves to the continuance of that which is false.

Here is an example. Isaiah vii. 14 says: "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son." Now, for centuries, the Church has taught, and still teaches, that this was a prophecy relating to the birth of Jesus! The fact is, the prophecy related to a child that should be born during the time that Ahaz was king of Judah, and this was some seven hundred years prior to the birth of Jesus! Superstition alone can make it appear that Isaiah knew more of this than other men of his time, or



than we can tell of a man who will be born seven hundred years hence. Isaiah prophesied this, as a "sign from the Lord" to Ahaz, that he should overcome his enemies, but that prophecy was never fulfilled.

If one reads the chapter, it will be found incoherent and disconnected, as were most of the writings of Isaiah. In the next chapter he tells of going "unto the prophetess; and she conceived and bare a son." Then the Lord told Isaiah to "call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz." This was probably represented as a fulfilment of the prophecy first referred to! The whole story is inconsistent and unworthy of rational belief. Special divine inspiration cannot be admitted. Such a theory would mean absolute correctness, no mystery nor ambiguity. Divine inspiration and uncertainty or imperfection are as inconsistent as truth and falsehood. As well might Bishop Potter have attempted to give to President McKinley a "sign from the Lord," during our war with Spain; or the Archbishop of Canterbury might give to Queen Victoria a "sign from the Lord," on the outcome of the Boer war! We should consider such things absurd. Why more so now, than 2600 years ago? On the other hand, even in recent times the Mahdi has had "signs from the Lord" in great abundance! The difference between intelligence and superstition is thus illustrated.

I feel and know that I have the highest reverence for our great master, Jesus, grandest human being of whom we have any account, but I find nothing to make me believe that His greatness or grandeur rested upon, or in any way depended on, prophecy or birth. I find nothing to induce us to accept either the prophecy or the physical circumstances related of His birth. In the nature of things, they are not, and never were, susceptible of proof. Only somebody said that Mary said so, and somebody said, that Joseph said, that, in a dream, an angel said so. The evidence is unsubstantial and entirely improbable, but, best of all, it is *utterly unimportant*.

The character of Jesus rests upon something broader, deeper than prophecy or birth, as different as noonday is from midnight. It rests upon His life and teaching!

His life of goodness!

His knowledge of His higher self!

His love toward His brethren!

His kindness to the poor!

His sympathy for the suffering!

His charity for the erring!

His forgiveness for His enemies!

His consideration for all!

His influence in the world!

Without doubt the writer will be called a heretic, by some who may read these pages. He has no objection to the term when he considers the

circumstances which call it forth. The army of heretics is a large and constantly increasing force.

The term heretic is of rather uncertain meaning, depending so much upon the standpoint from whence it proceeds. To the Jews, all Christians are heretics; to the Catholics, all Protestants are heretics; and to the orthodox Protestants, the more liberal thinkers are heretics.

How much does the world owe to heretics? The greatest of all heresies began 1900 years ago, and Jesus Christ was its great leader! Then for fifteen centuries all heretics were suppressed! And what centuries of darkness they were!

Then came the heresy of Copernicus, and that of Luther, and the world awoke and began its movement of modern progress.

Is not the foregoing plain, simple truth? Why not say then, the noble army of —— heretics? The ranks of this army are being constantly recruited from those who are seeking for truth. And indeed, any man who places a higher value upon truth, than upon tradition and legend, is liable to become a heretic in spite of himself. Let him fear not, he is in no danger. Whenever he exchanges that which is *said to be* for that which *is*, for him there can be only gain.

Some years ago, the writer was traveling by rail in the South. The train made frequent stops, and, of the local passengers who were constantly boarding and leaving the train, many were ac-

quaintances. Among these was an old-fashioned Methodist minister. He quite freely expressed his dissent from the custom of sending young men to Europe to be educated.

"Why," said he, "there was Edward . . . his father sent him to Germany. He remained there two or three years, and when he came back—he was a raving heretic! And there was Mr. So-and-so. He sent his son William to Germany. Before he went, he was as religious a boy as you'd wish to see, and when in a few years he returned, *he* was a raving heretic!"

The word "raving" was delivered with a long "a."

Our clerical friend could not realize that Edward and William had simply *begun to think*, a crime which he had scarcely committed during his whole life! He preferred superstition, and had much to say of the religion which he learned at his mother's knee.

Another incident here comes to my memory.

A few years ago, I was one of a small party that was being conducted through the great cathedral at Milan, Italy. Our guide, a very excellent one, paused in the central nave and directed our attention to a point high above us where two rafters met, and said:

"You see that little shelf? Well, on that shelf is a box, and in that box is a nail from the holy cross. Once a year, on the occasion of a certain

great feast which lasts for three days, that box is taken down and the nail is exhibited to the people, who are taught to believe that it has for them a saving virtue, and who therefore pay a small sum for the blessed privilege of looking at it. When it was down last in one day thirty-five thousand people, in two lines, passed through this nave, each one looking at the nail and paying the fee. Some, by paying a higher fee, were permitted to touch the nail, and these last believed that they received a larger proportion of divine favor."

My orthodox brother will hold up his hands at this and say: "What idolatry! What deception! What a delusion! What a shame that there should be teaching that aims to perpetuate such intolerable ignorance! How those poor people are deluded!"

Wait, my good brother, and let me tell you something. When you are asserting and explaining and preaching up the old doctrines of the "fathers," invented during the dark ages, *you are simply displaying the rusty nails of superstition!*

A few of these rusty nails are the doctrines of The Fall of Man; The Atonement; The Trinity; Justification by Faith; Adoption; Sanctification; Decree of Election, etc., etc. There are many more of them. They should all be put in the box with the alleged rusty nail from the holy cross. They are substantially the same, and are of equal

value and efficiency, equally powerless and deceptive!

What is the doctrine of the atonement? It is substantially this: James and John steal some apples from a farmer, who is very angry thereat. Thereupon, Peter catches the farmer's son (who is entirely innocent), and gives him a tremendous thrashing. With this the wrath of the farmer is appeased, and he forgives James and John. What could be more ridiculous, unreasonable or unjust? And yet this is practically the doctrine of the atonement, and not one whit more inconsistent!

The doctrine of the atonement has for its foundation the religious beliefs of early historic man, the belief that man must of a necessity do something to appease the wrath of a revengeful God — a time when our progenitors were in a condition of savagery. Hence came the belief in sacrifice, the burning of bullocks, sheep, goats, and doves. To pacify their enemies, they gave them food. God lived above the sky, and they could not reach Him, but the burning of flesh made a "sweet savor which ascended and went directly to their god" (Gen. viii. 21, "and the Lord smelled a sweet savour"). The books of Moses are filled with this teaching. Their sacrifices of beasts and birds were an atonement for their sins. In precisely the same manner, Calvinistic theology teaches that the sacrifice of Jesus was an atone-

ment for the elect, by and through which they receive the forgiveness and favor of God!

Jesus never taught nor even mentioned the doctrine of the atonement. Words and sentences must be strained and tortured to make such a construction of anything He ever uttered. On the contrary, He distinctly taught that love toward God and our neighbor is more than all sacrifice.

Equally absurd is the doctrine of "justification by faith."

Worse than all, however, is the doctrine of foreordination, which teaches that God *for His own glory*, created some men for the express purpose of torturing them throughout all eternity! Fear not, my friend, simply trying to live a good life! Such a God is as much a myth as was Jupiter or Pluto.

For further information as to these doctrines—see the "Westminster Confession of Faith," which has been considered the constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

God, as pictured in the Apostles' Creed, is represented by the Father, sitting upon a great throne. The Son is sitting upon His right hand. Nothing is said concerning the seat at His left hand, but it would not be unfair to presume, or assume it to be occupied by the Holy Ghost. To this conception, the early fathers, and many Trinitarians of the present day, direct their prayers! Some of the heathen pray to a wooden elephant!

One is as logical and as powerful as the other. If there is any difference, the wooden elephant has slightly the advantage, for that is at least something tangible, while the throne with its occupants is entirely imaginative. Neither ever did, ever will, nor ever can answer a prayer! In thousands of Sunday schools in our land, this conception of God is taught to-day, a god who rules, rewards, and condemns from a certain *place*, called heaven!

The cause of this goes back centuries and centuries to a time when the "fathers" undertook to explain what they themselves did not understand. How they reached their conclusions would be only a matter of conjecture. But the unfortunate part of it is, that their teaching is being preserved and sustained even now, in "prayers for rain," or "prayers for fair weather," or prayers that God will kindly prevent the wind from blowing, while some special person crosses the ocean! These prayers have been in use so many hundreds of years as to make it certain that, if they were ever answered, we should have seen the results. No evidence of the kind exists.

As for miracles, I do not think we clearly understand the accounts of them. For example—how is it possible to understand this miracle (see Matthew viii. 30.) :—

"And there was a good way off from them, a herd of many swine feeding.



“ So the devils besought him saying : If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.

“ And he said unto them, Go ; and when they were come out (of the men), they went into the herd of swine ; and, behold, the whole herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished in the waters.”

Orthodoxy will say this is figurative. I would inquire why it is more so than any of the other recorded miracles? How can you determine which miracles are figurative and which are not? The word “ figurative ” is often used as a most convenient post behind which to dodge.

A miracle is thus defined : “ An event in the physical world, wrought by God, independently of the agencies through which He ordinarily works.”

If we assume that the way in which “ He ordinarily works ” is natural, then clearly the miracle is supernatural, and in this sense it seems to be generally accepted by those who claim the absolute infallibility of everything in the Bible.

Miracle and superstition are closely allied. It is hard to distinguish between them. Theologians have vainly attempted it for centuries, and are tinkering at it still. For myself, I find no evidence to convince me that such a thing as a miracle, as commonly accepted, ever really occurred. The accounts are indefinite. Even in the example

given, the accounts lack conformability. Matthew says the devils came out of two men. Mark and Luke, speaking of the same occurrence, each say that they came out of one man. John says nothing about it.

Miracles are said to have been performed by Moses and the prophets, and also by the disciples after Jesus. It is claimed that they were necessary in the ancient days. On what basis can theology explain why they are not equally necessary to-day? Especially those theologians who are loud in their wails that "heresy is stalking through the land"? If ever a miracle was needed it is now, right now, for nothing short of the supernatural can prevent the collapse of the tottering dogmas and doctrines of the dark ages, tenets that are fast fading from our view. It does not seem that the miracle god is a very lofty image. One who makes laws and then occasionally breaks over them for the sake of a miracle scarcely seems to fill the true conception of an immutable, all-wise God!

Where shall we look for God? Look not for Him in some distant place! Look not for Him in the boundless Universe! Look for Him within yourself; and if you look "in sincerity and in truth" you will find Him. "The Kingdom of God is within you!"

Let any man, "in sincerity and in truth," ask his higher self, "What shall I do to be saved?"

and the answer is instantaneously, "*Do right.*" In order to *do* right, you must necessarily *think* right. If you *think* right and *do* right, you will *feel* right; and this is a condition not far from Heaven.

For myself, I have no conception of a higher form of religion than a true appreciation of the few lines I have just written! "The kingdom of Heaven is within you" seem to me the most remarkable words Jesus ever gave us, the very key-note of His religion! God dwells in His kingdom, and if His kingdom is within you, surely God is within you! Look for Him there! And how perfectly those words harmonize with "The Father that dwelleth in me," and "The Father and I are one!" My friend, the Father is within *you!* Look for Him there!

What is it that makes the acorn grow until it produces a tree? It is the power within itself!

What makes the bud to expand into the blooming flower? It is the power within itself!

What develops the tiny seed into the blade of grass? It is the power within itself!

What gives *you* physical growth? It is the power within yourself!

If the Creator implants such power in inanimate things and in your physical body, do you think He has neglected to supply your intelligence, your morality, your spirituality, with an indwelling power of growth? Has He omitted to provide

you with a guide to lead and instruct you, to bring you to a higher development? He has forgotten, neglected, or omitted nothing!

“The kingdom of God is within you!” *Look for Him there!*

I believe that the spirit of God dwells within every man! It shone in Moses! In Jesus it was and is an illuminating tower! It was a bright light in Luther, in Newton, in Shakespeare, in Darwin, in Channing, in Lincoln. It varies in different men—from the clear bright flame to the smallest spark, but it *exists* in all.

Jesus says: “The works that I do shall ye do also.” “The Father that dwelleth in me, He doeth the work.” “No man can come except the Father draw him.” “Behold the kingdom of God is within you.”

The Father is in us even as in Jesus, our Master; it is our higher self; and only through a recognition of this spirit of God within can man ever attain to his highest development; for man *can* grow in this recognition, by his own choice. Not in an instant, not at one bound, but slowly, steadily, and surely; and when he once comes into an appreciation of the value of this self-recognition, he will not exchange it for anything, or any conceivable condition, in this world. The one great essential is *absolute sincerity*.

Pray to the God that is within you! See to it, that your higher self is the controlling force of

your whole life! This is within your power, and when you have attained to that condition, it will lead you aright. You will have secured the Pearl of Great Price. You can go up higher *if you will*. This assertion is easily proved by its reverse. Every man *knows* that he can become a villain, *if he will*. The two elements are distinctly within you. The choice of which shall be developed into a controlling power rests entirely with yourself.

A man's existence is as though he were walking on one of the steps of a boundless stairway. To his right the steps ascend; to his left they descend. Go forward he *must*; but whether he will remain on his present level, or go up higher, or go to a lower level, is by his own choice. The whole human race are walking along with him on the steps of this great stairway. Some are on higher levels, some on lower, but all may go higher or lower as they will!

That there is a higher self existing within us is plainly apparent.

Mind embraces the intelligence, the thinking power, through which we study, learn, and reason. It is midway between body and spirit, or higher self.

Whether this self is further subdivided is beyond our vision. Among its attributes are Conscience, Reverence, the Affections, Intuition, Kindness, and Sympathy. These qualities do

not emanate from the mind or intelligence. A man may possess a powerful intellect, and yet be deficient or weak in any or all of the others, just as he may be physically strong, but weak in intellect.

Or let us take for example Intuition. Suppose that at the same moment three hands are brought in contact with a piece of red-hot iron. One hand is that of an old man, one that of a person of middle age, and the third that of an infant. Instantly all three hands are withdrawn intuitively. Intelligence has nothing to do with it. Plainly the action is independent of the mind. Reason did not direct it, for there was no time to reason. Perhaps some Doctor will suggest nerves ! Nerves are a part of the physical body, and, of themselves, have no feeling whatever. That nothing pertaining to the body has feeling, is clearly demonstrated in the case of a person under the influence of an anæsthetic.

Take the affections ; a man may be very much attached to a woman whom his intelligence utterly rejects. The same is the case where a woman is attached to a man whom she cannot respect. It is a dispute between reason and an opposing force within. To say distinctly what this force is, or whence it comes, seems impossible.

Perhaps there is no emanation from the higher self more distinctively clear than conscience, the natural faculty of judging between right and

wrong. It does not come from the intelligence, but if they are in harmony, both are strengthened. The same may be said of the emotions, as for example, joy or sorrow.

Creeds, doctrines, and dogmas do not make men religious. On the contrary, man's religious thinking has produced them. Let us have no fear of rejecting any religious theory that ever was invented if it fails to accomplish good! But let us reverence as true religion whatever demonstrates its power of making mankind better! "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Many years ago, a young man went from a home where he had been brought up under what might be called orthodox influences and surroundings. He went into the world, had many experiences, saw much of the light and dark sides of life in many places, in a great variety of circumstances and conditions. After some years he settled down, as they say, to business, giving it his entire attention. During his years of wandering, he had heard many preachers and listened, mostly by chance, to many religious controversies, occasionally reading something on religious subjects. No fixed impressions remained with him. He became skeptical and doubtful as to matters of faith and indifferent to doctrines and dogmas. A time came when he felt a little more interest in these subjects, especially in the question of immortality. Such churches as he attended gave

him little or no help. The preachers seemed indefinite and unsatisfactory, often illogical, giving themselves chiefly to attempts at explaining what he felt they did not themselves understand.

Here are a few of the many set phrases he used to hear from the pulpit :

- “ God’s Eternal Decree.”
- “ Assurance of Grace and Salvation.”
- “ Joy in the Holy Ghost.”
- “ Access to the throne of Grace.”
- “ The condemning wrath of God.”
- “ Godly Fear.”
- “ Grace in the Heart.”
- “ Wilful Schism.”
- “ Gospel plan of Salvation.”
- “ Satisfying the law.”
- “ God’s covenant with man.”
- “ Stirring up the Grace of God that is in them.”
- “ Saving Faith.”
- “ Scheme of redemption.”

To him these and many similar expressions were incongruous and meaningless. Was he irreverent? They sounded to him like “ tweedledum and tweedledee,” and he wondered how people could become enthusiastic under preaching so largely composed of, or based upon, these, to him, meaningless idioms.

He looked carefully over the creeds, with the result that he could no longer read them. He could neither make them harmonize with the sayings and teachings of Jesus, nor with his own in-



telligence. How little of satisfaction there seemed to be in what had come to his mind in the way of religion. Only a skeptic, in the dark ! ”

At length he heard a number of sermons read by George William Curtis. Some were written by Dr. Channing, others by James Freeman Clarke and by others of the Unitarian faith. Those who remember the fine elocution, the impressive manner and the deep earnestness of Mr. Curtis, will appreciate how really enjoyable these discourses were. To our friend they were a revelation, a something with which he could sympathize. They were the first sermons that ever really appealed to him. Especially was he interested in a beautiful discourse by Dr. Clarke, entitled “Go up Higher.”

Dreadfully unorthodox, but from those days orthodoxy was with him more than ever a back number.

He bought the works of both Channing and Clarke, and for the first time in his life (though then in the forties) was able to feel interested in reading sermons which wasted no time or words on doctrine or dogma ; sermons which taught that the religion of Jesus is love toward God and all that is good, and kindness toward our fellows ; sermons which taught that character is salvation !

He had a great admiration for these lines of Leigh Hunt :

“ Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase !)  
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,

And saw within the moonlight in his room,  
 Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,  
 An angel writing in a book of gold :  
 Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,  
 And to the Presence in the room he said,  
 'What writest thou?'—The vision raised its head,  
 And, with a look made all of sweet accord,  
 Answered—'The names of those who love the Lord.'  
 'And is mine one?' said Abou. 'Nay, not so,'  
 Replied the angel.—Abou spoke more low,  
 But cheerly still; and said, 'I pray thee, then,  
 Write me as one that loves his fellow-men.'  
 The angel wrote, and vanished. The next night  
 It came again, with a great wakening light,  
 And showed the names, whom love of God had blessed—  
 And lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest!"

"One who loves his fellow-men." What was he doing for his fellow-men? Anything? Possibly a little—but so little! Was he working with his best thought? Was the world any better for his having lived in it? Was he improving the condition of anybody or anything? Was he improving himself? Did he appreciate his responsibility to his Creator, his responsibility to his fellow-men, his responsibility to himself?

A time came when this man said: "My Father, my Creator, and my God! I know not where or how to find Thee, but I believe that Thou dost exist, and that Thou art mindful of Thy creatures. I would come to Thee, my Father, but I have so little to bring, so little to offer! So little of good! So much of indiffer-

ence! I can see but one good thing within myself, but one thing that is satisfactory, a desire to improve, a wish to grow better! It is so weak and inefficient! It is like a little plant growing among the weeds! Father, let it not perish! Bless its growth until it shall overshadow and control my whole life! In my blindness, give me guidance! In my weakness, give me strength! In my poverty and want, give me help as Thou knowest my need! May I yet be an instrument in thy hand of doing good to my fellow-men!"

This prayer was repeated many, many times, is repeated yet, may be repeated forever!

Years passed away, bringing little change—years of carelessness, years of lack of earnestness toward that which is good. Finally came sickness, pain, and suffering. He has remembrances of doctors, surgeons, anxious faces, nurses, consultations, medicines, operations, long days, weeks and months of wavering between life and death.

Then came what the doctors called convalescence. He could totter around. He could walk. He could go down upon the street for five, ten, twenty minutes, for an hour or more. Here improvement seemed to halt. Pain, suffering, nervousness, weakness, and unrest seemed his portion!

Is it strange that he walked the streets wondering why the doctors could not cure him? Or that he thought of death as his only release, and

hoped that it might not be long delayed, or that it required all of the little strength he had to keep from ending his own life?

Here comes a change! Here rises a star!—a ray of light—a glimpse of day!

For many years his wife had been interested in mental healing, a believer in its truth, though with comparatively little of the knowledge of it, which comes from seeking and from experience.

She urged him to go to a mental healer. At first he could not be persuaded to go. He told his wife that such a treatment "might do" in nervous diseases and the like, but it was in his case simply absurd,\* in fact that she knew very little or nothing about it.

There was no small amount of controversy on the subject. He could only see the absurdity of such nonsense; she maintained that it rested upon foundations of truth. She more than maintained her position, for after a time he consented to be treated by a mental healer, provided his physician did not object! That functionary was consulted and gave his consent, said "it could do no harm." In truth it is but justice to him to say that he gave the plan his approval, through the fact that he himself had a high appreciation of the value of a placid mind in all cases of disease.

The mental treatment began, and with it began

\* This is the usual view of those who know nothing of mental healing.

an improvement little dreamed of by the beneficiary. When he first stated his case to the healer (guide or helper would be a more descriptive name), he had little or no faith or hope of benefit. Like the doctor, he thought it could do no harm, and there was a glimmering possibility that it might do good. Though improvement became almost immediately apparent, he still clung for a time to his doctor and surgeon. The last time he saw the latter, he said (and no surgeon in America stands higher in his profession) that further surgical treatment was imperative. He privately told the wife that "to save life, an operation was absolutely necessary within two weeks."

Our friend wavered—not knowing what course to take. Not so with his wife. No wavering was there, though against the advice of both surgeon and physician she stood bravely for no operation.

Very soon the doctors were given up entirely—all dependence upon them ended, and our friend from that time has relied only upon Mental Treatment, under which the tendency has constantly been toward improvement. Since then more than two years have passed. He has grown better, stronger, happier, and within the past few months has been able at odd times to write this little book!

He has grown better from every point of view—stronger, clearer in mind, happier. Friends tell

him he is growing younger. He rests contented in the belief that the power that created him, dwells within him, and will never leave nor forsake him. He asks for no better light than that which God has given, the in-dwelling, ever-developing higher self, confident in the faith that it will forever guide him onward and upward.

## APPENDIX.

IT seems to me entirely proper and right for any man who has sincere religious convictions to express them to his fellow-men in any manner he may choose. I will go a little farther and say it is his plain duty to do so. What I have written I believe to be true. There remain to be added only a few words as to what in my opinion should be the Creed of all Christians.

It is *absolutely essential* that it should be broad enough to embrace all who believe in the Saviour.

It is equally true that Christian Unity must be established, before the world can be Christianized.

I believe the Creed of the Universalist Church, as given in the chapter on Universalism (see page 124), will ultimately be adopted; omitting the words "and will finally overcome all evil." Not that I reject the expression, but because some Christians may believe that evil has existed throughout the beginningless past, as a necessity in God's eternal purpose, and that as He is changeless in His work, evil will necessarily continue forever.

The Creed would then be: I believe in the Fatherhood of God; the Brotherhood of man; the Spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ, and the immortality of the soul.

I believe that Goodness is the eternal law of God; and that only as we accept and practise this law can we find peace in this world or in the world to come. Can there be anything said by Christians against any statement in this creed?

It is related of Abraham Lincoln that on a certain occasion, when asked why it was that he had never united with a church, he expressed his inability to sincerely accept any of the special creeds submitted to him and closed his remarks with these words: "When any church will inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification for membership the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both Law and Gospel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself'—that church will I join with all my heart and all my soul." Certainly, Lincoln could have subscribed to the foregoing Creed.

I am plain enough to prefer the broad manhood and charity of Lincoln to the narrow and cruel theology of Calvin, or the absurd and blasphemous inventions of Athanasius!

That unity, which should exist in Christianity, can never be attained while each denomination insists on its own peculiar views. At the outer



door of the temple of United Christianity, the Catholic must leave his Pope, his powerful Saints, Ah! even his Blessed Virgin!

The Episcopalian must be willing to relinquish his forms and ceremonies! The Baptist must give up the idea that it is necessary to swim under water! The Presbyterian must divest himself of his load of confession-of-faith! All must abandon their cargoes of details! They are non-essential and unimportant.

In their stead, let all Christians follow the plain teachings of Jesus! Let us take Him as our Leader until we can find a better one! Let us be governed by His example and by the reason that has been placed within us by His Father and Our Father!


## NOTE.

THIS book has been printed chiefly for distribution among my friends and acquaintances.

Should any of them, however, require additional copies, they can be obtained from the publisher, Wilbur B. Ketcham, 7 & 9 West Eighteenth Street, New York, at \$1.00 a copy, or \$7.00 a dozen.

If any profit should result from those that are thus sold, such profit will go for the benefit of the Charlton Industrial Farm School, a brief account of which will be found on a few succeeding pages.

J. S. H.



Charlton Industrial Farm School (New Building)  
Charlton, Saratoga Co., N. Y.



## THE CHARLTON INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

CHARLTON is a township and village of Saratoga County, N. Y. Some two miles from the village, and about seven or eight miles from Schenectady, is located the Farm School referred to on the preceding page.

It was founded some four years ago, by five residents of the town, assisted by some of their old schoolmates who had become residents of New York City.

The best farm in the township, comprising two hundred acres of excellent land, was purchased, together with stock, tools, and furniture.

The object is to provide a home for wayward and homeless boys, who are just beginning a career of vice, taking them from the roads that lead toward crime, the prison, and the poorhouse, and giving them a good home, where they are placed under the best influences, like those of a farmer's family, receive a good common school education, are taught farming, and especially the raising and care of fruit trees, including planting, grafting, budding, trimming, and the care of fruit.

Above all, the greatest pains is taken to impress upon them the value of character. In fact every-

thing possible is done to turn them to the right paths, and finally make of them good and useful men.

The officers at the farm are, a superintendent, a teacher, and a matron.

The whole is under the control of a board of trustees, consisting of five prominent citizens of the town. Their term of office is five years. A new trustee is elected in January of each year. The board of election consists of the five trustees, the supervisor, and the justice of the peace of the township, seven in all, and this arrangement is to be continuous, under the charter from the State of New York. The institution is also under the State Board of Charities.

There are at present twelve boys at the school, all we could accommodate in the old Farm House. During the past year, however, we have erected a new brick building, which is capable of accommodating thirty boys, besides the officers and farmer. We expect to increase our number of boys to thirty, as we can see our way to their maintenance and support.

The new building with furniture cost about \$22,000. It is very substantial and complete. Care has been taken to avoid giving it the appearance of a public institution. On the contrary, it looks like a great generous Farm House, one that our boys can, in after life, remember with feelings of affection.

Should our income be sufficient, we could easily accommodate ten more boys in the old Farm House, making forty in all.

We have also the beginning of an endowment fund which we shall endeavor to increase to an amount that will make the school absolutely permanent. To this fund subscriptions are invited.

Dr. James T. Sweetman, of Charlton, Saratoga County, N. Y., is Secretary and Treasurer, and to him all communications should be addressed.















